00098431

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

N.N.M. 47.

CONTRASTS

By
William Gilbert.
William Gilbert

DEDICATED TO THE RATEPAYERS OF LONDON

98431
a1

STRAHAN & CO.
56 LUDGATE HILL, LONDON
1873

[*All rights reserved.*]

LONDON:
PRINTED BY VIRTUE AND CO.,
CITY ROAD.

00098431

CONTENTS.

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTORY	1
II.	THE POOR LAW	22
III.	THE POOR LAW (*continued*)	56
IV.	SICK ASYLUMS AND HOSPITALS	83
V.	SICK ASYLUMS AND HOSPITALS (*continued*)	109
VI.	SICK ASYLUMS AND HOSPITALS (*continued*)	137
VII.	PAUPER SCHOOLS	172
VIII.	CHARITY SCHOOLS	202
IX.	CHARITY SCHOOLS (*continued*)	222
X.	LIVERY COMPANIES	258
XI.	CONCLUSION	292

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

AMONG the many singular contrasts to be detected in the idiosyncrasies of the inhabitants of the Metropolis, one of the most remarkable is the jealous manner in which they will scrutinise every fresh governmental tax proposed to be levied on them, no matter how small its amount, and will yet submit to any fresh pecuniary burden the municipal authorities may think fit to lay on them without the slightest opposition, or, at most, with only a scarcely audible murmur. Let the reader only think of the violent opposition the inhabitants of the Metropolis would raise against the proposition to levy an extra penny in the pound on the income-tax. An

increase of fourpence or fivepence in the pound for a metropolitan rate would probably, at the same time, however, be readily accepted by them without their even taking the trouble to investigate whether the amount was really needed. Again, even in the matter of rates it not unfrequently happens that the ratepayers, represented by their Vestries, would appear to make their resistance the more energetic in proportion as the amount to be expended is the smaller; the vigour of their opposition diminishing as the amount demanded is the larger. Lately, in a certain metropolitan district, possessing an enormous rental, the Vestry deliberated for more than three hours over the question, whether the buttons on a new coat required for the beadle should be of brass or woollen, the difference between the two being $4\frac{1}{2}d.$! And yet about the same time, and without the slightest opposition, they quietly met a demand from the Metropolitan Board for their proportion of a loan

of two millions sterling, to be levied on the Metropolis for some contemplated improvements, one of the principal features of which was the enormous destruction they would occasion of the dwellings of the working classes; and all this without any proposition being made for the rebuilding of others in their place.

Were the wealthier classes, well-to-do shopkeepers, and persons of good incomes, alone interested, the indifference thus shown by those who have the selection of the members of Vestries, to the subject of over-taxation in the Metropolis, would be a matter of less moment than it now really is. Ratepayers having the power to elect their own representatives, and the intelligence to understand financial questions, are little to be pitied if unnecessary burdens, occasioned by jobbery, extravagance, or incompetence, are imposed on them. There are, however, many thousands of ratepayers in the Metropolis who are too fiercely engaged in the battle of life

to give attention to the subject, or whose intelligence is too limited to grasp it. Those to whom a few pounds a year is a matter of great importance, and who are perhaps obliged to squeeze the poor's and metropolitan rates they are called on to pay from the meals of their children, are entitled to some protection from those who are richer than themselves, and who have leisure and ability to pay attention to the subject. It has been stated, and with reason, that the population of London may roughly be divided into two classes—the ratepayer and pauper; many of the former being so poor as to be separated from the latter by a mere imaginary line—and that every increase in the rates drives a certain number across it to swell the ranks of pauperism. Even at the present time, in the season of prosperity we are now enjoying, the clergy of all denominations, parish surgeons, and relieving officers in all parts of London, could relate instances of the most honour-

able struggles among the poor ratepayers to keep themselves from the degradation of asking for parochial relief. And for the rates to be increased on these, when not absolutely necessary, as is continually the case, is obviously a gross cruelty.

And then, again, it is too frequently imagined that the tenants of houses are alone the ratepayers. This is far from being the case. On the contrary, if the matter is carefully examined, the lodger is found to be proportionately a heavier ratepayer than the tenant; for he has to pay not only his share of the rate levied on the house, including rent, but the profit obtained on the brokerage by his landlord. It may be taken as a fact that at present the dock-labourer who pays 4*s.* a week for his room indirectly contributes at least £2 18*s.* a year to municipal taxation. It has often been argued that, although the ratepayers in the poorer parishes in London may be more heavily taxed than the richer, in proportion to their means, their

house-rent is much cheaper, and therefore they have little right to complain. This, however, is not the true state of the case. Any one acquainted with the amount of rent paid for the wretched rooms of an immense number of ratepaying houses of the working classes in the eastern districts of the metropolis, can prove that, so far from their house-rent being less in proportion to their means than that of the wealthier classes, the direct contrary is the case. It is common to find a six-roomed house that did not, perhaps, cost £200 in building, let out to lodgers, each room paying at an average 4*s.* a week, or in the aggregate £64 a year. And this is far from being a solitary exception. Whole rows of houses might be found in Hackney, Whitechapel, and Bethnal Green, yielding even a larger return than this.

Again, in these districts it is no uncommon thing, in times of distress, to find scarcely one house in a row that does not contain some individual receiving paro-

chial relief; while the amount levied for the poor's-rate on the whole will even be in excess of the amount of out-door relief granted to the occupants of the houses. In this way the poor in the district not only are obliged to maintain their own poor, but positively to pay a surplus beyond it for the general rating of the Metropolis. On these occasions it not unfrequently happens that the dock-labourer in work is contributing to the relief of the weaver thrown out of work; or in times of hard frost and long-continued easterly winds, the dock labourer thrown out of work is relieved by his then more fortunate fellow-lodger, the Spitalfields weaver.

But even the patience of metropolitan rate-payers may have a limit, and there have lately been certain indications that they consider the amount of municipal taxation is becoming insupportably oppressive. And thus it is possible that were the subject now inquired into, and better understood by

the ratepayers at large, some action might be taken by them to relieve the present enormous expenditure. I therefore take this opportunity of rushing into print, with the intent to prove to my brother ratepayers that a very considerable portion of the rates at present levied on them is totally unnecessary to procure the results obtained; and that were our charities and endowments better administered, a still further reduction might be effected, without these being in any manner whatever diverted from the intention of the founders.

The late Lord Brougham is said to have once stated at a public meeting, that if the sick and educational endowments of London were spread with economy and efficiency over the whole area, their revenue would be sufficient to relieve the whole sick poor of London, and to supply the means of a good education for the poorer and lower middle class, without need of calling on the ratepayer for assistance. How far this is

the case I will not pretend to say; but no one can dispute that in many instances our metropolitan endowments might be made to yield a far greater amount of good to the population than is now obtained from them. Take, for example, three of our great metropolitan hospitals—Guy's, St. Bartholomew's, and St. Thomas's. Find the value of the ground they stand on, and the buildings erected on it. Add to these the amount of their revenues, and the total would probably be found sufficient to build and in great part maintain every metropolitan Poor-law infirmary, including imbecile, lunatic, and special asylums, in the most perfect manner, without the cost of one shilling to the ratepayer. Add, again, to these the effect of a more economical distribution of the funds of our great educational endowments, and then imagine how great would be the benefit, not only to the ratepayer, but to the poor also.

But it may be argued that the three hospitals named do not belong to the Metropolis

at large, but are special endowments, instituted for particular purposes, totally irrespective of municipal supervision or control. This argument may be valid in the case of Guy's Hospital, but certainly not in those of St. Bartholomew's and St. Thomas's. The two last-named were, in fact, the original Poor-law infirmaries of the Metropolis, and have no right whatsoever to be termed exclusive institutions. St. Thomas's, to which I shall later have occasion to allude at considerable length, was one of the Royal hospitals of the City of London, established for the relief and maintenance of the poor of the Metropolis, under letters patent of Edward VI., June 26, 1553, for the incorporation of Christ's, Bridewell, and St. Thomas's Hospitals. By these it is clearly shown that the original endowment of St. Thomas's Hospital was neither more nor less than that of one of the pauper sick asylums of London. Certain lands, houses, and estates were assigned for the maintenance of

these three establishments; but, owing to the great increase in the numbers of both sick and poor, in consequence of the abolition of religious houses at the time of the Reformation, the endowed funds of these incorporated charities were found insufficient to carry out the intention of the founders, and money and alms were ordered to be collected at the different churches in London for their support.

In the reign of Elizabeth the poverty of London greatly increased, and the incorporated hospitals of Christ Church, Bridewell, and St. Thomas's were in danger of being closed for want of funds to support them. A precept of Elizabeth, dated April 24, 1561, was issued to the aldermen of the different wards in London, insisting on collections being made every Sunday at all the churches, in which the congregations were desired to give according to their means. This precept, after regretting the impoverished condition of the above-mentioned hospitals, insists that

the aldermen "doo dylygently move and stûrre all them that charitably doo styll geve their almes to thie saide vse" (the maintenance of the three hospitals above-named) "to continue the same, and all those that have as aforesaid wtdrawen their saide almes, to revyve and recontynue the same, and all those that hitherto have not geven any such wekely almes, now charitably to begyn somewhat to geve, and from hensforth to contynue the same, wtout the which ayde, reliffe, and helpe of the good and well disposed citezens and inhabytants of the saide citie, the saide houses, for a most godly and most charitable vse and purpose lately erected and founded, cannot long be maynteyned and contynued."

In point of fact, this precept appears to have been merely an order issued in accordance with the Poor Law then in force, and passed in 1551, in which it was ordered that collectors of alms should be appointed throughout the country, who should "gently ask every man and woman what they of their

charity will give weekly to the relief of the poor," and which, in fact, was the origin of our present Poor Law. No alteration appears to have been made in the laws as to the intent of St. Thomas's Hospital during the next century; for in a report of the President of Christ's, Bridewell, and St. Thomas's Hospitals, alluding to an order of Common Council made October 11th, 1587, "the Lord Mayor is recommended for the time being to order the constables and beadles of the wards to arrest all vagrants, sick and indigent poor, and to bring them to Bridewell, that their case may be examined into; and to dispose and sort the sick poor and lame who are curable to St. Bartholomew's and St. Thomas's Hospitals." Several attempts were afterwards made by the authorities of St. Thomas's to release themselves from the jurisdiction of the City, but without success; and St. Thomas's still remained the hospital for the City sick poor, under the management of the aldermen and civic authorities, till the year 1809. Then,

unfortunately for the ratepayers of the Metropolis, Lord Chancellor Eldon, who, in the reformation of the organization of our charities, seems to have acted on the principle since followed by his many successors—to obtain the smallest possible amount of good at the heaviest possible amount of cost—revised its administration in such a manner as to deprive the civic authorities of all but a nominal power in its management. This hospital has since remained a public endowed charity, under independent management, and totally separated from the Poor-law authorities, and the metropolitan sick poor under them, for whom it was originally endowed.

Perhaps the best description of the uses for which the City hospitals were instituted may be judged from an extract from a report issued in the reign of Charles I., by the governors of Christ's, Bridewell, and St. Thomas's Hospitals, addressed to the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of London. The report "recommends the Lord Mayor for the time

being to order the constables and beadles of the wards to search from time to time for all sorts of rogues, vagrants, idle women and children, which beg, wander, and lie idle in the streets, and bring them to Bridewell, to be seen and examined by the governors thereof, assisted by two governors of each of the other hospitals, and to dispose and sort the sick poor and lame who are curable to St. Bartholomew's and St. Thomas's; the small children, not able to work and born in the City, to Christ's Hospital, to be brought up and taught, and when twelve years old to send them back to Bridewell, to be employed in some good occupation; and the stout and sturdy rogues and vagabonds, and the women and others of small strength, to be employed in Bridewell." The report is dated the 20th of April, 1643, and is signed by the president, three treasurers, and eleven governors, and the following note made thereto:—"We, whose names are subscribed, have perused this report, and conceive it to

be according to law, and may produce good to the City. (Signed) Peter Pheasaunt, serjeant-at-law, and John Greene, serjeant-at-law, and judge of the Sheriffs' Court." The report being openly read in the Court of Aldermen, was allowed of, and ordered to be entered on the Repertory, and to be performed in all things.

If the reader will contrast the original use and organization of these four institutions, as described above, with their present condition, it would be difficult for him not to admit that they have been strangely diverted from the intention of the founders; and I submit that the question of their reorganization, so as to be made more applicable to the uses for which they were originally intended, is one well worthy of the consideration of the ratepayer. If an agitation for the purpose were organized, it is more than probable it might be successful; and if so, a very large amount of taxation at present tamely submitted to by the inhabitants of the Metropolis

might be removed, to the benefit of both ratepayer and pauper. The reader may possibly urge against the suggestion, that the present organization of these different institutions has met with the approbation of the Court of Chancery, after having been duly investigated, as well as ratified by Government. But a very slight research into the history of the Metropolis during the last half century will show that there is close relation between municipal reform and strong and angrily developed public opinion. If to the wealthier ratepayer the threatened increase of rates, and their oppressive tendency, is a matter of comparative indifference, it behoves the poorer ratepayers, both tenants and lodgers, to inquire strictly into the matter, both for their own advantage and that of those who are poorer than themselves.

It is frequently maintained by the upholders of the present system that there is no danger of any further increase in the metropolitan rating; and yet, while that state-

ment is being put forth, a demand is made for the sum of three millions for the use of the Metropolitan Board, besides the expenses of the School Board, which at present is *only* to be 2½*d.* in the pound, and this, including the reserve fund for building purposes, is equivalent to the interest on an additional six millions, as well as the sums required for rebuilding fresh metropolitan Poor-law infirmaries, and other matters. Nay more, we have been assured for several years past, whenever a fresh impost was about to be levied on us, that, so far from increasing the rates, the money about to be raised should be considered in the light of a profitable investment which would in the end greatly diminish our taxation. Has not the reverse been the case, and the rating of the Metropolis, as might naturally have been expected, increased in proportion with the amount levied? Can the reader point out a single parish in which this has been the case? Ten years since the parish of Kensing-

ton was, in proportion to its income, considered about the average of the metropolitan parishes, or possibly a trifle under it; but since that time the sum levied for rates has increased from £11,000 to £54,000 a year. In the last two years and a half the poor's-rate alone, notwithstanding the enormous destruction of the dwellings of the working classes, to make room for the mansions of the rich, has increased forty per cent. In other parishes, less able to afford it, the proportionate increase has been still greater.

But I may be told that the subject of the abuse of our endowments, the extravagance of our Poor-law system and that of the Metropolitan Board of Works, has been often investigated, and that on every occasion they have come out free from blame; that the subject is most unattractive, and very probably totally unnecessary; that I can mention nothing that has not been already stated over and over again, *usque ad nauseam et longuis;* that any arguments I can adduce, or accusations of

mismanagement I may bring forward, would be as useless and incorrect as those that have preceded them. To this I reply, that it is not my intention to use the current stock arguments, true though many of them decidedly were, nor to bring forward any accusations against either the Poor-law authorities or the trustees or managers of our different municipal endowments. I intend proceeding on a totally different principle, not uttering one word against any institution, but candidly admitting the good done; and, that I may not be accused of prejudice, I will accept the reports—where reports have been printed—of the different institutions as positive and perfect proofs of the correctness of their statements. It is my intention, however, by a series of "Contrasts," to bring under the notice of the reader other institutions and enterprises working to the same end, whose results are at least equal, and whose economy is far greater, and then allow him to judge for himself whether there is not room for im-

provement—whether, in fact, more might not be effected by our Board of Works, our Poor-law authorities, and the trustees of charities and endowments, for the amount which is at present expended. To carry out this plan, I propose to divide the subjects of municipal taxation in the following manner:—The Poor-law relief, and different objects comprised under the head of poor's-rates; our great charitable endowments, both medical and educational; the expenditure of the Metropolitan Board; the waste in our City corporations and Livery companies, as well as the loss occasioned to ratepayers by the amount of land remaining unoccupied in the City and other localities. And I am not without hope that, if I am sufficiently fortunate to obtain the attention of the reader, I shall be able clearly to prove that we are at present annually contributing from three hundred thousand to half a million more than is required to procure the good obtained.

CHAPTER II.

THE POOR LAW.

FROM the quotations I introduced in the last chapter respecting the Royal Hospitals, it may fairly be considered that the end and aim of the Poor Law, as originally instituted, was neither more nor less than the regulated almsgiving of the community. If so, it would perhaps be impossible, in the whole history of charitable enterprise or municipal ministration, to conceive an institution under which the amount of benefit obtained is so extravagantly, yet so unsatisfactorily, worked out. Although no opposition is made to the poor rate, the charitable element it ought to contain is neutralised by the unwillingness with which it is paid.

By the recipient it is not only accepted without gratitude, but the honourable poor, who in the time of their distress would receive private assistance, and be thankful for it, look on the same amount offered by the Poor-law authorities in the light of an insupportable degradation. Nor is this statement any mere figure of speech. Some time since, when conversing with a German lady, an inhabitant of Dresden, on the assistance given to the poor in England, she remarked —"There certainly must be something radically wrong with the administration of charity in your country. In Saxony we are far poorer than you are in England, but not a case can be brought forward of a person dying from starvation. And yet, especially in winter time, it appears almost impossible to take up a London paper without finding notice in it of some lamentable cases of persons who have perished from want of the necessaries of life. There surely must be a great amount of cruelty and neglect in the

administration of your laws, or such things could not possibly occur."

It is but natural that such statements should strike a foreigner with wonder, especially one who is accustomed to read our newspapers; for nothing is more common than to find, in the same sheet, some inflated eulogy passed on our charitable institutions, at a public dinner given for the benefit of one of them, and an account of some poor woman found starved to death in her room. Although the conclusion my lady friend had arrived at,—that there was a great want of good management among us,—might be excusable, at the same time, if thoroughly investigated, it would be found that in nine out of ten of these lamentable cases, especially cases of women, the death had been occasioned by their horror of the degradation contained in Poor-law relief, and their womanly and honourable aversion to allow their miseries to become known to the world. So far, however, from the guardians of our

metropolitan parishes being the stony-hearted individuals they are considered, I believe it would be impossible for any men to be actuated by more philanthropic motives. That they are not free from blame may be true, but I will endeavour to show that the principal censure to which they are open is, that they display moral cowardice, when attacked by sensational articles in the public press, in shrinking from investigation rather than boldly challenging it. That lamentable cases of apparent neglect and mismanagement occasionally occur must be admitted; but if the guardians of the London poor would boldly insist on comparing the institutions under their management with others applauded by their accusers, it would frequently be found that, so far from having anything to fear from the comparison, they would prove their own class of institutions on the whole the better managed of the two.

Nor are the guardians of the poor the only persons on whom a wrong impression is

thrown, certainly by the west-end public. The working classes themselves, from whom the general pauper is recruited, are equally subject to cruel and undeserved animadversion, and perhaps more so. That the increase of expenditure on the pauper has had a tendency to invite more to become paupers than would otherwise have been the case, cannot be disputed, though certainly to a far less extent than is imagined. There is something ingenious in the pains certain philanthropic reformers adopt to escape from the accusation of want of charity, which might be cast on them, by throwing the blame upon what they are pleased to call the indiscriminate almsgiving which is bestowed with such reckless profusion in the eastern and south-eastern districts. I was present some time since at a meeting on the subject held in the Adelphi, in which the present system of almsgiving was condemned in the strongest manner. It was asserted by one titled philanthropist, that the money thrown broad-

cast among the inhabitants of the eastern districts was tending to deprive the working man of that spirit of independence which has hitherto been considered one of his brightest ornaments—that, in fact, the working man, instead of honourably relying upon his own industry for support, was changed into the mendicant; or, to describe the effect in the mildest way, by teaching him to accept alms you smoothed away all dislike to pauperism. He maintained that charity given in the lavish manner it is given in London, is scarcely less reprehensible than the imposture of the mendicants who, with false tales of distress, impose on the sympathy of the benevolent; and that frequently the west-end charity was found supplementing the out-door Poor-law relief, thereby encouraging the pauper to continue idle.

I attempted to ask the noble lord, and his supporters who had spoken in the same strain, whether they were aware of the number of individuals in the receipt of Poor-law relief,

and what might be the sum so lavishly spread broadcast over that number, as I much suspected that the whole amount of charity distributed among the great mass of poor was so infinitesimally small as to be hardly possible to find its coin equivalent; and that even if distributed among the recipients of out-door relief alone, the money each would receive would be of the most trifling description. The meeting had, however, already arrived at a conclusion on the subject, and I found it impossible to obtain a hearing. Now, I maintain that ninety-nine out of every hundred of the working classes of London, so far from pressing forward with hands open to receive charitable relief, or knocking at the workhouse door to receive Poor-law assistance, as a rule support their misery with the most heroic dignity and patience. I may be told that scarcely a day passes without the Charity Organization and Mendicity Societies bringing to light some gross case of imposition on the charitable, and that these are

merely isolated cases compared with the many others that are unheard of, and which therefore go unpunished. This objection is very easily answered. The impostor takes every occasion to thrust himself under the notice of the public, pleading his cause with energy and often with eloquence, and omitting no opportunity to receive remuneration for the imposition he is practising. But we hear nothing of the thousands and tens of thousands of cases where the poor, both men and women, submit to the greatest privation rather than condescend to receive charitable or parochial relief, preserving with their silence the most unblemished integrity.

I can here anticipate a possible objection on the part of the reader. He will argue that no inconsiderable portion of the misery which the poor suffer is due to their improvident habits. They appear to have no idea of thrift—no thought of laying by for a rainy day, although when in work they are paid good wages. Skilled workmen, in fact, in many

of our manufactories, are often better paid than clerks of ten years' standing in Government offices. Many receive a wage that would be equal to the salaries of two curates. Yet, on the first temporary reverse of fortune which happens to them, from slackness of trade or domestic misfortune, they are obliged to rely either on the charity of others, or to apply to the parochial authorities for assistance. Remarks such as these are in everybody's mouth, and proverbially what everybody says must be true. An exception must be made, however, in favour of our highly-paid skilled mechanics. Thriftless they may be, but certainly not to the extent generally imagined. Many of them have good balances in the Savings' Bank, and not only this, but vast numbers subscribe to the Trades' Unions; and these, with all their faults, have the good effect of establishing a close bond of friendship and brotherly feeling among their members; while the sums expended in support of the sick and unemployed would, if

more generally known, perhaps surprise those who are inclined to hold that Trades' Unionism does not possess a single good attribute. And it should be borne in mind that in the east and south-eastern districts of the Metropolis, which contain a population of some six hundred or seven hundred thousand souls, there are at least two unskilled labourers for every skilled artisan, and that these, on an average, are paid a far lower rate of wage—scarcely one-half of that paid to their more experienced fellow-workmen. Again, a vast proportion of the working population of the Tower Hamlets are neither skilled artisans nor unskilled labourers, and there are also an immense number of widows with families, and others, who are solely dependent on their own exertions. These last earn on an average an amount which, when compared even with ship labourers and alongshore men, is very trifling.

Let the reader enter the front room of this small four-roomed house. It is occupied by

two respectable young women (sisters). They are absent at present, being employed the whole day as packers in a large biscuit manufactory at Dockhead, on the other side of the water, where they work from seven in the morning till six in the evening. Add to this the time occupied in going to and from their workplace, and their hours of labour will average twelve and thirteen a day. For this they each receive about seven shillings weekly. Their room, as you perceive, is neat and clean, and there is little or no appearance of poverty about it. Possibly they do not save money. The visitor will admit that it will not be easy for them to save on such small means; besides, one of the sisters is delicate, and requires good nourishment, and in consequence they are obliged to have meat to dinner at least once a week. In the same house there are two other women living, who earn a livelihood by making glass bugles. Their hours of work are from six to six, to which is to be added about an

hour a day in going and coming from the scene of their labours. Few have any idea how much a slight change in fashion will influence for good or evil many of those trades depending on its caprice. At present the trade is tolerably brisk, but a change may occur which will oblige them to learn and take up some other handicraft. Like the biscuit packers, they earn about a shilling a day when in full work.

But let me now introduce the reader to another establishment, in which the inmates are not only receiving parochial relief to the amount of 2*s.* a week and two loaves of bread, but are in receipt of what philanthropic reformers term supplementary Poor-law relief—the aid of private charity, possibly to the amount of 1*s.* or 1*s.* 6*d.* a week. It is also certain that the woman obtains a little money from other sources, rendering the case still more suspicious. The room in which the family live is not particularly neat, and it certainly might be cleaner. The woman is

seated before a table covered with scraps of cloth of different qualities, the husband by the fireside, with his back to his wife. He is unoccupied; but the woman is making boys' caps. She finds the material and thread, and when she has completed a certain number, she sells them to the clothiers at $4\frac{1}{2}d.$ apiece. After paying for the material, she has about $2d.$ on each cap to recompense her for her labour. By hard work she can get through six caps a day. She can do more in summer, when the days are longer, and could even do more now by working at night, or in the morning before daylight. And here the reader will perceive how minute calculations these humble workers are obliged frequently to make as to profit and loss. The cost of a candle, were she to work by its light, would be at least as much as the money she could earn; so that, after all, it would be but labour thrown away. Where two or three single women live together the case is different. They then have a candle among them, and

are thus enabled to obtain a certain amount of profit on their labour, miserably small as it may be. But it may be asked why the husband of the woman does not assist her. The impediment he urges to his doing so is unanswerable—he is blind. The reader will possibly admit that in cases such as these there can be no great sin in supplementing Poor-law relief by a little private charity.

Let us now try another class, whom the public, with justice, look upon with great sympathy—the poor needlewomen. These, as a rule, will endure the most severe privations without condescending to apply for Poor-law relief, or to ask for private charity, though of the two they would prefer the latter, as being less derogatory. They abound in the eastern districts to such an extent that it would be impossible to obtain anything like a faithful impression of the whole, so various are the kinds of labour they are engaged in—so wide the area over which they are spread. I will select as my example those employed in coarse shirt-

making, who are among the most industrious of that industrious sisterhood. The one I will take as my type is an excellent hand, as may be believed, for she is able to make two shirts in one day. For these, in the trade, she will receive the sum of 9*d.*, she finding her own needles and thread. Another proof that she is a good workwoman is the price given; for the average amount paid by contractors and clothiers rarely exceeds 4*d.* a shirt. Things have changed for the worse with these poor women during the last few years. Some six or seven years since, an institution was organized in Hinde Street, Manchester Square, on certainly a most benevolent principle, the working expenses being paid by private subscription, while the whole of the money earned was paid to the workwomen. A skilful needlewoman could there earn, by making soldiers' shirts, from 9*s.* to 10*s.* a week. The institution, however, after working admirably for some years, was closed, in consequence of Government having given notice that the

manufacture of soldiers' and sailors' shirts and other clothing would be undertaken in future by the War Office. The records of that extinct charity, if examined, would afford some most honourable proofs of the integrity of these poor women. The rule was, that they were to work three days at the institution, to test their capabilities as workwomen. Afterwards, they were allowed to take, without security, the work home with them, and bring it back when finished. In two years, out of 170,000 shirts, &c., given out to be made, twelve only were unaccounted for.

The women who work at men's outer garments are quite as poorly paid. Frequently whole families together are engaged at this work. A woman employed on a rough pilot coat, which would take her two or three days to make, will scarcely earn more than 1*s.* 6*d.* to 2*s.* for it. Those making canvas trousers for sailors are paid only 4*d.* a pair; those making them in cloth of a quality similar to that worn by soldiers and sailors, will receive only

8*d.* a pair. By hard work, a poor woman and her elder girls may earn from 6*s.* to 7*s.* a week, but for this they must work hard. If their pay is a trifle better than the shirt-making needlewoman's, their work is far more laborious. The stuff on which they are employed is frequently very thick, and requires considerable strength to put the needle through it. Their progress is consequently much slower than if they were working on linen or cotton. Small as their pay is, they consider themselves fortunate to obtain the work; for they know that, flourishing as commerce may be at the present time, there are many hundreds of their handicraft who have nothing to do. Still, they are not without grave apprehensions for the future; for, even as better workwomen, they can easily foresee that in a short time the same causes which affect the less skilful in their trade will also reach them. The sewing-machine is rapidly gaining ground among the slop-workers, and very soon almost the

whole of the work will be done by it. As one machine will do the work of at least five women, the lot of the greater number who now earn their living by slop-work will be most miserable.

Suppose, as is very commonly the case, a poor woman of this class has three children. The eldest, a boy, earns a trifle as errand-boy to a tradesman in the neighbourhood, and the two others are too young to earn anything. Of course, the amount the mother obtains for her work is insufficient to support her family, and she receives a trifle from the parish, and it is more than probable that beyond that the parish relief is supplemented by a ticket for tea, sugar, or some loaves of bread, and perhaps a trifle in money from one of those so-called obnoxious societies which spread their charity so lavishly over the eastern districts.

But it may be said, "Where is the husband—the legitimate bread-winner of the family?"

If in work, the family are in comparative

comfort; for they do not receive either charity or Poor-law relief when that is the case. Let us assume, however, that the husband is a dock labourer, and that, like many others, he may be out of work, not "on strike," or "locked out," but kept from gaining his bread by that most merciless of all tyrants —the east wind—which keeps shipping from coming up the Channel, so that there is little or nothing to do in the docks.

It must be borne in mind that the class of cases and trades I am mentioning are not the poorest to be found in the eastern districts. There are many other trades and handicrafts far worse paid. Frequently whole streets are occupied by them, every room containing a different family. I will take, as an example, one I inspected some three or four years since, in St. George's-in-the-East, as it is a specimen of many others in the same neighbourhood. This street contained some sixty or seventy small four-roomed houses, and the inmates averaged four in each room. In one

house I entered, the front room was occupied by a slipper maker. Her husband was a dock labourer, and then out of work. The pay of the slop-workers, mentioned above, was liberal when compared with that of this poor family. She was employed in making what are technically termed "uppers" of carpet slippers. Her work consisted of sewing up the sides, and binding round the edges. She makes, in fact, all necessary preparations for their being fixed on the soles, which is done by another class of workers. She was paid $3\frac{1}{2}d.$ a dozen for these uppers, and was assisted by one of her children, a little girl; and the two could make about a dozen and a half a day. As it was utterly impossible for her to live on that sum, she was frequently an applicant for Poor-law relief, and the agents for the Metropolitan District Visiting Society, and the Society for the Relief of Distress, in King Street, St. James's, frequently assisted her, and apparently without any fear of endangering the welfare of their souls by so doing.

But the slipper makers often avail themselves of other means of obtaining a little money. They go out as washerwomen or charwomen to the needlewomen, showing that in the lowest depths among the poor there is a lower deep. The needlewomen are worked so hard, that, to use their own phraseology, they have hardly time "to wash their own faces." They cannot afford to lose a moment, and as a number of them often live in the same house, they frequently employ one of the slipper makers to clean their rooms and wash their linen. For this service she is paid 6*d.* and a meal for half a day's work, or 9*d.* and two meals for a whole day's work. The quantity and quality of the meal is regulated by custom —each meal generally consisting of a cup of tea and some bread and butter. The parish nurse, who is on speaking terms with most of the poor mothers in the district, generally acts as a sort of gratuitous agent in these matters, and she is overwhelmed with applications to procure charwork for the slipper makers, and

is equally overwhelmed with thanks—her only payment—when she succeeds.

In the same house I not only saw more than one case of distress, the family at the time being in health, but an excellent typical case of their sufferings when there was sickness among them. The tenant of the room was a poor widow with two children—a girl about thirteen, and a boy of eleven. The boy, who was constitutionally delicate, was ill in bed, having been struck down by fever, through hard work and insufficient food. He and his sister were employed in a lucifer-match manufactory in Finsbury. They used to walk every morning from their house in St. George's-in-the-East to the factory, and return home between six and seven in the evening. Their combined earnings amounted to from 3*s.* to 3*s.* 6*d.* a week, and out of this sum they had to find their own dinners, generally consisting of dry bread, which they took with them. The boy's constitution at last gave way, and he was obliged to give up work. Fever soon after

appeared, and the parish doctor was called in, who advised that the child should be sent to the workhouse infirmary, where he would be better treated than he could be at home. The present stringent regulations respecting fever and small-pox among the poor were not then in force, and the woman resolutely declined to part with her child. She had hitherto contrived, she said, to keep herself and her family out of the workhouse, and she would not degrade herself by allowing her boy to be sent there. The disease increased, however, and at length the other lodgers in the house interfered. They strongly advised the mother to accept the doctor's offer, and backed up their advice with good arguments. The woman at last gave her reluctant consent, and the sick boy was removed to the workhouse infirmary, where he somewhat improved in health. His mother, however, found life insupportable without him, and setting at naught the advice and entreaties of her friends, brought him home again. At

the time of my visit I found a woman sitting by the bedside of the boy (who was then in a high fever), employed in slipper making; but she was not the mother,—the latter, having been fortunate enough to obtain a day's washing, was absent at her work. The slipper maker by the child's bed lived in a room above, and had come down to nurse the sick boy while his mother was away.

Children generally are employed in making lucifer-match boxes, and are paid at the rate of 4*d.* a gross. A clever child will earn from 1*s.* to 1*s.* 6*d.* a week, if industrious. Since the date of my visit, however, a threatened strike occurred among the lucifer-match and box makers, and their wages have been increased at the rate of about 4*d.* a gross. This certainly has been a benefit to them; at the same time, it cast a heavy tax on others scarcely better off than themselves. The increased tax fell on the retailers of lucifer-match boxes, who really pay the increased remuneration for labour, it being

no easy matter to increase the price of a box of matches from the halfpenny which seems to be the regulated sum, and it would certainly be beyond their mathematical powers to divide the augmented cost of the wholesale article, even were they willing to do so.

It would seem impossible that greater poverty or worse paid labour could be found than the handicrafts I have mentioned; and those employed in them, it should be borne in mind, may be reckoned by thousands, and are among the most frequent applicants for out-door relief. Such, however, is far from being the case, and I saw a proof of it in the same house. I entered the back room on the top floor. It was wretchedly furnished, containing merely a truckle bed, a table, and a broken chair. On the chimney-piece was a jug, a cracked tumbler, a teapot, and a cup without a saucer. On a shelf beside the fireplace was some bread, a little packet containing perhaps an ounce of tea, and a small conical-shaped brown-paper parcel.

The parcel might have weighed about a quarter of a pound, and from the somewhat damp appearance of the paper it evidently contained brown sugar. There was no fire in the grate, and the room was in great disorder. On the table were two strong knives and a small whetstone, as well as a number of rough pieces of wood, such as might be picked up in a carpenter's yard, or found in the road when a house is being pulled down. Similar pieces lay on the floor, as well as a number of chips. Utter thriftlessness and disorder seemed to reign in the place. The occupant of the room, an elderly woman, miserably dressed, was in perfect keeping with her surroundings. I found her half leaning, half sitting, against her bed, with her arms folded on her breast, her eyes fixed gloomily on the floor, as if she were aware that the chips ought to be swept up, and yet grudged the trouble it would give her. On inquiring into her case, I found that, much as appearances were against her, she

was not without excuse. She earned a scanty pittance by making skewers for dogs' and cats' meat. She found her own wood, and received 8*d.* a thousand for them. The news had just been spread that the dog-tax was to be rigidly enforced, and that thousands of dogs would be destroyed. She had endeavoured to extend her custom by making skewers for the butchers, but the trade had been almost entirely monopolised by the gipsies, who threatened to undersell her if she interfered with them. At the time of my entering her room, she was deliberating whether she would make a struggle to avoid the degradation of pauperism, or at once give up all hope, and enter the workhouse.

Possibly, in the case of the skewer maker the lowest grade for remuneration has been quoted. The reader should, however, be aware that there are many other trades quite as ill-paid. I will take as an example another female handicraft—that of sewing hooks and eyes on cardboard for linen-

drapers. Latterly, however, the linendrapers have adopted the system of selling these by the ounce, and the result is that this trade has fallen off, and, like the skewer maker, the women who followed it will possibly soon have to apply for admission into the workhouse. Besides these, there are scores of female handicrafts which furnish recruits for parochial relief, the very names of the trade for which they are occupied rarely reaching the ears of the polite public; and although comparatively few, in proportion with the population, may be employed in each trade, in the aggregate they form a numerous body. There are the women who are employed in doing needlework for umbrella makers. They stitch the pieces of alpaca or gingham together, making the cover ready to be placed on the frame. They receive 10*d.* for a dozen covers. Then, again, there are hundreds of women employed by penny toy makers. I know not what their earnings may be, but they are

trifling, as the reader must admit if he buy some of these toys, and, with the toys before him, calculate how much labour has been bestowed on them, and consider how the shilling he paid for the lot has to be divided between retail dealer, manufacturer, and the woman who made them. Then, again, there are women who work in the cinder yards. These, perhaps, of all other portions of the population, are the most grateful for fine weather. Their wage averages about 10*d.* a day, deduction being made from that amount when the weather is rainy. There are women also who work at preparing haddocks and sprats for drying, and in fact a hundred other occupations which it would weary the reader's patience even to hint at.

But there are another class who comparatively rarely apply for Poor-law relief, keeping their miseries a secret from all but those who they know will sympathise with them, and who receive charitable relief with real, genuine, and heartfelt gratitude. These are

the small dealers, whose trade capital averages from *1s. 6d.* to *20s.*, or, in the case of small chandlers or sweetstuff-shop keepers, from £2 to £3. To quote one or two of this class will be ample to give the reader an idea of the whole. I will take the case of one among the humblest of this class of traders. Her occupation consists in extracting from dust-bins small pieces of old cloth or linen, empty pomatum pots, cups without saucers and saucers without cups, knives nearly worn out, scissors in a sad state of rust, and many other articles of a very mixed and incongruous description. This dealer generally attends small open-air markets in Ratcliff Highway or Commercial Road. Her class are as a rule shrewd people of business, with possibly as much innate talent for commerce as the most important merchant in London. They know full well the value of every article they buy or sell, and can judge to a nicety the deduction that ought to be made for a crack in a cup, or for the amount

of wear a knife has undergone. Two or three hundred per cent. profit in this way of business is by no means extraordinary. Yet, on the whole, their income is exceedingly uncertain. During long-continued rains they dare not expose their wares in the open street, and the result is they are frequently obliged to make fearful inroads on their trade capital to purchase food, and if the bad weather still continues, to apply to the parish for relief.

But to judge of these small traders more correctly, the reader should some Saturday night visit the open-air markets in Ratcliff Highway and Whitechapel Road, and he would then judge for himself how hard a struggle in the battle of life many of these poor creatures—all directly or indirectly rate-payers—go through before they come to the parish for relief, and what a vast amount of real good the charitably disposed may do who assist cases of this kind with judgment and discrimination. Those in a grade some-

what above the last-mentioned class are frequently much to be pitied. The small chandler-shop keepers, whose capital is, in proportion to the above-named class of traders, much larger, are frequently in little better plight. Even now that commerce is more flourishing than it has been for years, their business hardly furnishes them, in many cases, with the barest necessaries of life; and the records of the Society for the Relief of Distress, and the Metropolitan District Visiting Society, might yield many proofs how secretly and patiently they bear their troubles, and with what gratitude they accept a few pounds to enable them to continue their struggle, and keep themselves and children off the parish. The co-operation societies which have lately been established are doing them immense injury, whatever good effects they may otherwise have. Wherever one is established, it certainly has the bad effect of bringing at least a dozen poor shopkeepers to the very verge of ruin.

The case of the weavers—no unfrequent applicants for Poor-law relief—is also a sorrowful one. In the present day the remuneration they receive for their labour, men and women alike, is miserable indeed. The velvet weavers get 1*s.* 2*d.*, 1*s.* 3*d.*, to 1*s.* 6*d.* a yard. They usually receive from the manufacturers warp sufficient to make about thirty yards, and after preparing it for weaving—which generally takes them upwards of a day—they have to put what they call fifty-four or fifty-six wires to the inch. The shuttle is then thrown through the warp three times for each wire, and the wire is then cut out. This process has to be repeated fifty-four or fifty-six times before an inch of velvet is made. Besides all this, for every quarter of a yard from ten minutes to half an hour must be spent in preparing more silk to be worked up. If the materials are good, something more than a yard may be made in fifteen or sixteen hours. When the thirty yards are finished it is not unusual for a weaver to wait two or

three weeks before he gets more work. Before Canning's bill for the introduction of French silks became law, an expert velvet weaver could earn from £2 to £3 a week; now 12*s.* is the utmost he can make. Female weavers who are widows, or have sick husbands, generally earn less than this. Other classes of silk weavers are in an equally depressed state. The worst paid among them are the umbrella-silk weavers, who receive only $5\frac{1}{2}d.$ a yard, and the funeral-silk weavers, only 4*d.*

CHAPTER III.

THE POOR LAW (*continued*).

IN the present condition of the Spitalfields weavers there is something very lamentable. The thought that the members of a whole handicraft, one of the most intelligent in the kingdom, are becoming extinct, is exceedingly depressing. Yet it is no figure of speech to say that the Spitalfields weavers are dying out. Nor are they alone in this predicament — many other branches of the trade are scarcely in a better position. Then, too, there are in the eastern districts thousands of others without a trade, who live by "chancing it,"—picking up odd jobs for a few pence, sometimes hawking things about the streets when they have a

few shillings' capital to commence with—leading a shiftless, thriftless, vagabond existence. These form an especially numerous class of recruits to our workhouse infirmaries, and yet they are not, as a rule, idly disposed. No trade has ever been taught them, and their constitutions are too delicate to bear heavy unskilled labour.

But if these are to be pitied, their children are more so, and threaten for the next generation a very powerful addition to the pauper ranks. All medical men in the eastern and south-eastern districts are aware that among the poorer and worst-paid classes there is a great degeneration in race; the children exhibiting the usual signs of imperfect constitutions. They are narrow-chested, have imperfect muscular development, and very faulty teeth. Nothing is more common than to find among them children of from thirteen or fourteen years of age with scarcely a back tooth in their heads. The subject is well worth the attention of the philanthropist,

the legislator, and though last, not least, of the ratepayer. Whether some remedial measures may yet be adopted, it is impossible to say; if not, the proportionate number of those likely to come upon the rates in the next generation will be far in excess of those in the present day, numerous as they are. It was stated by one of our most eminent surgeons, who had paid great attention to the decline of physique in men, that during the forty years he had been in practice in the Metropolis, he had never found a working man of twenty-one years of age whose father and grandfather had been born and resided in London. Medical science in the present day will enable men to live who would have died in the last generation; but their lives will be one of continual misery and hardship. It may easily be imagined that, with such a teeming, delicate, and uninstructed population, both technically and literally, the number of those requiring assistance beyond the produce of their own in-

dividual exertions must be very great, and the immense number of 174,725 paupers—including in-door and out-door, sick, and children—proves it, and that too in the present flourishing condition of the nation. The out-door alone, who are those on whom the so-called supplementary charitable relief is said to be thrown broadcast, number, according to the parliamentary return of 1871, no fewer than 135,829 souls.

Let us now see how far the supplementary charitable relief so much deprecated by our stern moralists and reformers will go among so great a multitude, and what is the amount of demoralization it produces. As before stated, the three bodies principally offending in distributing so lavishly indiscriminate charity, are the Metropolitan District Visiting Society, the Society for the Relief of Distress, and the Stranger's Friend Society. On referring to the annual reports of these societies, it appears that the gross amount distributed by them over the poorer portions

of the eastern metropolitan parishes would not, for the last two years, have averaged more than twopence per head per month, for the six winter months, on the gross number of paupers receiving out-door relief. It may, however, be confidently asserted that of the sum expended in charity by these three societies, not one per cent. goes to supplement Poor-law relief, but is distributed almost entirely amongst those who abstain from applying for it. It may be said that there are many other organs for distributing charity besides the three already named, as well as many sums given by private individuals. All this may be true; but place the gross amount given by the rich at double the sum given by these societies, and still little danger need be apprehended from the demoralization which is so much dreaded.

That the poor do receive a vast amount in charitable relief over and above these sums is perfectly true; but those who imagine this

comes from the wealthier classes are grievously in error. Few who have not visited in the poorer districts can form any idea of the vast amount of charity and kindness which in time of distress is shown by the working classes to each other; their charity appearing to increase in proportion to the smallness of their means. Yet, by some singular inconsistency, those reformers who beg us to stay our hands from distributing charitable relief never reproach the poor, who can less afford it than the rich. The inhabitants of the poorer parishes supplement Poor-law relief, as well as give, with far greater liberality than the rich, to those who are trying to avoid the degradation of asking for it. So far from the inhabitants of the wealthier west-end parishes having cause to apprehend danger from this so-called lavish abuse of public and private charity, it would be found, if the question were more deeply investigated, that in a pecuniary point of view they are much benefited by the practice.

Let me take an example, and contrast the demand made on the poor's-rates when a family enter the workhouse, and the same when they receive out-door relief, supplemented by private charity.

A dock labourer, with a wife and four young children, in receipt, say, of 18*s.* a week all the year round, is suddenly, either from sickness, accident, or long-continued east wind, thrown out of work. His wife's earnings, as shown in last chapter, must at best be scanty, and after struggling for a short time, the family, we will suppose, is obliged to apply to the parochial authorities for relief. Their case is inquired into by the relieving officer, who finds it a deserving one, and they are allowed 4*s.* a week and four loaves of bread. They go on for some time on this scanty pittance, gradually selling or pledging the few things they have on which a trifle can be raised. The first of these is, of course, the wife's wedding ring. This article is much esteemed by poor respectable families in the

eastern districts, as in a pressing time some shillings may be raised on it at a few minutes' notice. It is, in fact, the best security they can give for money borrowed, and for that reason it is always the first pledge redeemed from the pawnbroker. I have seen in a pawnbroker's shop at Wapping, in a time of distress, a box measuring a foot square, filled with wedding rings, locked up with their check duplicates—if that be the proper term. The clothes of the parents are next pledged, and possibly the wardrobe of their children may be next encroached upon. And here we may notice a very singular contrast between the respectable and the disreputable of the poorest classes. With the former, the wedding ring is invariably the first thing pledged; whilst a drunken mother generally sells her children's shoes, if in good condition, or else their clothing,—the value of the wedding ring having long since been spent in the gin shops which our benevolent licensing magistrates have spread

so thickly over the eastern districts. And now comes the so much deprecated supplementary relief to the Poor Law. The three societies named will certainly give the dock labourer's family some trifle, and their poorer neighbours still more; till at last they are worn out, and the family applies to the parochial authorities for more liberal relief. This, in nine cases out of ten, is refused, though not from want of charity among the guardians, but from the knowledge that one-half, or perhaps a majority, of the ratepayers in the district, both householders and lodgers, are at the moment verging on pauperism themselves. The man makes another attempt to obtain work, and fortunately succeeds before all his friends are tired out, and the family are again in comparative comfort.

Let us now suppose that this man and his family had, on their second application, accepted the offer of the workhouse. What would have been the consequence? Instead

of admitting them, it would have been a better policy for the guardians to have said to the man, "My dear fellow, give yourself no further uneasiness about your family. You say you earn 18*s.* a week when in work. Well, we will give you the 18*s.* a week; go and smoke your pipe, loaf about the streets, spend your time in the public-house or anywhere you like. Do not be under any anxiety for the future; your money will be paid you regularly every Saturday till work becomes plentiful again." It may be thought this would be rather an extravagant method of administering Poor-law relief, yet so far would it be the other way, that the ratepayer would make a positive profit by the transaction. On an average, every individual—man, woman, or child, sick or healthy, infirm or able-bodied—costs the ratepayer, including his house rent, 10*s.* a week, and it will therefore be seen that, rather than allow the man and his family to enter the house, the ratepayers, by paying him his full wages

of 18*s.* a week, would have been £2 2*s.* a week in pocket by the transaction.

Let me now show the west-end ratepayer what he personally has gained by supplementing Poor-law relief, which has kept the dock labourer from entering the workhouse. While receiving out-door relief the whole of the cost fell upon the district in which the man resided; but had he entered the workhouse the cost of his maintenance would have been thrown upon the general fund, one-fifth of which would have had to be borne by the parochial districts of Kensington, St. George's Hanover Square, St. James's Westminster, and Paddington. I will examine the question more in detail,—for the deeper it is gone into, the more extravagant does our system of Poor-law relief appear,—and compare the lot of the dock labourer when at work, with a wife and two children, with that of two adults in Kensington workhouse, and four pauper children in the Hanwell schools.

It has lately been shown, by a parliamentary return applied for in 1871 by Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens, member for Finsbury, that the cost of two adult paupers, for *maintenance* only, in Kensington workhouse amounts to 12*s.* 2½*d.* a week; and that it was at least as much—if not more—before the late agitation of the Poor-law question began. The cost of four pauper children in the Hanwell Asylum schools, for maintenance and establishment charges only, is £1 8*s.* 6*d.* a week. Before the late agitation there were far fewer children in the schools, and their proportionate cost was considerably higher. But, even with the reductions which have been effected, it would appear that two adult paupers and four children receiving in-door relief in the parish of Kensington cost the ratepayer £2 a week for maintenance, clothing, and establishment charges alone. There is, however, a further point to be taken into consideration: in the sum named the paupers' house rent is not included, which at

a low average would cost 20*s*. a week more for the six.

But contrasts may be drawn which will appear even still more striking. The dock labourer when again in work is not only obliged to pay his own rent and the arrears which has accrued during the time he was receiving parochial relief, but he is further obliged, being directly or indirectly a rate-payer, to contribute to the maintenance and house-rent of the two pauper adults in the workhouse, and the four children in the Hanwell schools, out of his hard earnings; they being placed on the general fund, to which the whole Metropolis contributes. And it not unfrequently happens that he is obliged to raise the required sum by reducing the already scanty food of his children.

In analysing the different items of Poor-law expenditure in the Metropolis, one of the most expensive will be found to be the maintenance of the sick poor. And here arises a question especially worthy of the attention of

the ratepayer. For it is more than probable that, were matters fully investigated, it would be found that, if certain charitable endowments, instituted for the support of the sick poor, were applied to the uses intended by their founders, considerably less than is now demanded would be required from the ratepayers.

The extraordinary excitement produced a few years since by the revelations of the *Lancet* Commissioners respecting the treatment of the sick poor in our workhouse infirmaries must still be fresh in the memory of all. Our feelings were harrowed by details of the indignities and cruelties said to be exercised by the Poor-law guardians on the unfortunate creatures under their charge. Loud, indeed, was the cry of indignation which arose not only in the Metropolis, but through the length and breadth of the land; and furious were the invectives heaped on the heads of those who, having these helpless creatures under their control, had allowed

such malpractices to be carried on by their agents with impunity for so long a time. The mildest term of reproach applied to the guardians of the poor was, that they were actuated by selfish motives, thinking only in what manner they could reduce the rates, and thereby save their own pockets and those of their fellow-parishioners. Others went still further; in fact, almost to the extent of accusing the guardians of certain parishes of being actuated by a morbid feeling of cruelty, which delighted in watching the miseries of the poor creatures who had the misfortune to fall under their management.

Nor were the guardians of the poor altogether without blame for the erroneous opinion the public had come to hold regarding them. When the attack was first made on the workhouse infirmaries, instead of boldly replying to the charge, and admitting that the examples quoted by the *Lancet* Commissioners were true, although only exceptions, they all took fright, and seemed

only anxious how they could best escape censure, considering themselves fortunate if the particular infirmaries under their own management were kept from the scrutiny of the public eye. And severely have they been punished for their moral cowardice; for the indignation aroused by the reports of the *Lancet* Commissioners became accumulative, till to be called a Poor-law guardian was almost a term of reproach, no matter how honourable or humane might be the individual holding the office.

As in most other cases of the kind, when the sympathies of the public are once aroused, numerous plans were suggested to remedy the evil, and philanthropists started up on all sides, each with his favourite nostrum—more or less practicable — which he insisted on bringing under the notice of the public. Thanks, however, to the tact of Mr. Ernest Hart and the other *Lancet* Commissioners, these different elements were at last concentrated, and a powerful Association, under

distinguished patronage, was formed, having for its object the reformation and improvement of workhouse infirmaries. For the furtherance of this praiseworthy object, a numerous meeting, which was presided over by Lord Carnarvon, was held in Willis's Rooms, and at which the Archbishop of York and several other celebrated philanthropists were present. For some time the proceedings were conducted with tolerable regularity, and loud indeed was the applause which greeted each speaker when he explained the purpose of the meeting, and the benefits he expected would arise were the objects they had in view fully carried out. So far all went on smoothly enough; but at last one speaker, thinking fit to accuse the Poor-law officials of a certain parish of gross cruelty to the sick poor under their charge, received so emphatic a negative from one of the guardians of the parish, that the equanimity of the meeting was greatly disturbed, and it was with no little difficulty that order was

restored. Even then, although the proceedings went on with greater regularity, sufficient discontent was from time to time exhibited to indicate that a change was about to take place in the minds of the Poor-law guardians, and that they would no longer submit quietly to the libellous attacks made upon them.

Had the guardians of the poor at the time asked the medical authorities of the different metropolitan hospitals — who in many instances led the outcry against them —whether, in the establishments under their care, equal irregularities or mal-administrations might not have occurred, it is more than probable that they would have found great difficulty in answering the question satisfactorily. Conscientiously feeling at the time that the guardians of the poor had in many instances had considerable injustice done them, I determined to ascertain whether cases quite as reprehensible might not be found in the metropolitan hospitals; and

in a very short time I had several brought under my notice, some of which, if published, would have made quite as sensational paragraphs as those current at the time against the workhouse infirmary management. Two or three I will quote.

The maid servant of a family residing in the west-end of town was sadly afflicted with toothache. Not wishing to trouble her employers with her trifling infirmity, she one afternoon took the opportunity, when the pain was severe, to apply at one of the best-conducted hospitals in London to have the tooth extracted. This was done, and the poor woman returned home. The pain in her face, however, instead of diminishing, increased, and she was unable to continue her work. One of her fellow-servants brought her case under the notice of their master, who, imagining that there was more mischief than could have been caused by a decayed tooth, wrote a note to an eminent surgeon of his acquaintance, asking him as a favour to

examine the woman's mouth. He did so, and found the jaw had been fractured. On inquiring the name of the dentist who had drawn out her tooth, she mentioned that it had been extracted at —— Hospital. The surgeon, knowing the dentist of that hospital to be a man of great skill, expressed his surprise at the circumstance, and determined to investigate the matter. He found that the poor woman had not seen the dentist, who, with the surgeons, had left the hospital before she arrived there. The under-porter, an aspiring young man, had often imagined that little skill was required to be a dentist, and as patients occasionally called in the afternoon to have teeth extracted, he thought he might as well qualify for the profession. Having dressed himself in his Sunday clothes, he passed himself off to the woman as the dentist of the hospital, and by the bungling manner in which he performed the operation, fractured her jaw. He appears, however, to have had skill enough

to be aware of the mischief he had done, and prudently quitted the hospital the same evening, and had not since been heard of.

An athletic man, in a bricklayer's dress, one day applied to a certain charitable institution near St. James's Square for assistance, saying that he was in great distress. As a strike existed in London at the time, the secretary told him they would do nothing for him, as it was not their province to assist people who were out on strike.

"I'm not out on strike, sir," said the man; "I'm a cripple, and can't get work."

"You do not look like it," said the secretary.

"But I am, sir, for I've lost the use of my right arm," said the man. "I'd the misfortune to break it, and haven't been able to work with it since."

"Show me your arm," said a medical gentleman, a friend of the secretary, who was present at the time.

The man stripped his arm, and the doctor,

on examining it, found that it had been broken, and set in a most unscientific manner.

"What was the name of the surgeon who set your arm?" he inquired.

"Faith, sir," he replied, "I don't know, for I never saw the same young gentleman two days running."

The fact was, the man had been treated as an out-patient at —— Hospital, and the house surgeon having been absent at the time, had left his duties to one of the younger students. The next day another had bandaged his arm, and during the days of his attendance he had never seen one of the principal or assistant surgeons.

A poor boy was a patient in one of the male wards of —— Hospital. He had been seriously ill, and was very fractious. One night he disturbed the other patients by crying and asking for his mother. The nurse, not imagining that he was in any danger, scolded him for making so much noise, and told him to be quiet. The poor child tried

to obey her, but soon again commenced to cry. The whole of the patients in the ward being unable to sleep, became irritated, and complained to the nurse. She went to the child's bedside and said—

"You young monkey, if you don't keep quiet, I'll box your ears for you."

"Stop, nurse," said a male patient, leaving his bed, "I'll do it for you;" and going to the child he shook him soundly, and told him that if he did not hold his tongue, he would slap his face.

The poor child became silent, but in a short time recommenced his cries, though in a very subdued manner. Gradually they subsided, and he was quiet. The next morning the nurse, on going to the child's bed, found that he was dead. The nurse and all the patients were greatly alarmed at the circumstance, but they said nothing of it at the time, all apparently determined to keep the secret. A few days afterwards, however, the matter oozed out, and the governors,

indignant at the unintentional cruelty done the child, immediately ordered an investigation on the subject. It was found that the nurse, and the patient who had threatened to strike the child, had left the hospital, and in spite of all the willingness of the governors to have them punished, they were unable to discover them, and the matter dropped.

I collected from different hospitals half a dozen similar cases. I reflected whether I would not bring them under the notice of the public: but the thought occurred to me that these six cases were the exceptions. Possibly sixty thousand cases had at the same time been treated with the most praiseworthy humanity and skill, and that, as each separate case had already been brought under the notice of the governors of the hospital, it would be useless to cast unmerited blame on those institutions. The reader must admit, however, that such cases as these might easily be "cooked up" into as sensational an article as any of those which teemed in

the public papers at the time above alluded to.

But in another way somewhat undeserved censure was thrown on the guardians of the poor—that is to say, if the faults and abuses complained of are to be regarded as equally objectionable in relation to a public hospital as in a workhouse infirmary; and it may be asked why these were not brought under the notice of the public also; for absolute silence seems to have been maintained by all medical authorities on the point. Among the objectionable features in a certain workhouse was the close proximity of the dead-house and dust-bins to the infirmary, thereby vitiating still more the already deteriorated atmosphere of the wards. I remember, at the time of the agitation, conversing with a physician who had shared the strong prejudice then extant against the workhouse infirmaries and their management, and who was himself attached to a first-rate west-end hospital. He had expatiated at great length on the disgrace-

ful fact that so many of the workhouse infirmaries had their dead-houses near their windows. I admitted that it would certainly be better were they further off; but I inquired of him how the dust-bins and dead-house were situated at King's College Hospital?

"I don't know; I never inquired," he replied.

"In the Middlesex how are they situated? Are they further off than those in the average of workhouse infirmaries?"

"I am unable to say."

"How are they in Charing Cross Hospital?" I inquired. "From the confined situation of that hospital, I should say they cannot be far distant from the building."

"I never inquired," he replied.

"How are they in St. George's and Westminster Hospitals? If I mistake not, in one at least the dust-bin is directly under the female accident ward; and I believe not simply the dead-house, but the dissecting-

rooms, are hardly, if at all, beyond the ground plan of the building."

He made no reply.

"I was informed," I remarked, "by a Poor-law surgeon that not many years since, in two of the west-end hospitals alone, more typhus and hospital gangrene broke out in one year than in all the workhouse infirmaries in London together in ten years. So bad, in fact, was it at one time that the question was mooted among the governors and medical men of one hospital whether it would not be better to close the building. Why were these things not brought under the notice of the public?"

"I really don't know," he replied, testily.

"But you are attached to one of the hospitals," I remarked.

"That may be," he said. "But let us do one thing at a time. At present we have our hands full in reforming workhouse infirmaries, and it will be time enough to take up the other question when we have finished with them."

CHAPTER IV.

SICK ASYLUMS AND HOSPITALS.

WHATEVER may have been the opinion of the Poor-law guardians as to the truth of the censures heaped upon them, the public press seemed unanimous in their determination to support the new Association in their endeavour to effect a radical reform in the management of the pauper infirmaries in the Metropolis. The Government also, urged on possibly by the strong expression of public opinion, determined to act energetically in the matter, and an Act of Parliament was passed changing the whole system of Poor-law medical relief. Appropriate asylums were to be built for the sick—some for general, others for special

diseases. Those in London were to be erected at the cost of the ratepayers of certain defined Poor-law districts, and the maintenance afterwards of the staff was to be borne by a common fund raised over the whole of the Metropolis. When this bill passed the Legislature, Mr. Gathorne Hardy received compliments and congratulations from all sorts and conditions of men. Never, it was said, had a wiser or more humane law been passed in the country. It was one which did credit to its promoters, and to the whole British nation, showing, as it did, the sympathies of the English people for their poorer brethren, and their determination that all suffering from sickness should be well cared for. The Government was urged to put in force, with as little delay as possible, the excellent law they had so lately passed. Architects of the greatest eminence were now invited to send in plans and estimates for the different asylums. Plots of ground were purchased, plans for the future

administration of the different establishments were proposed and determined on, the medical officers and officials were no longer to be under the direction of the Poor-law guardians, but under the control of the Poor-law Board, and the whole system of nursing was to be changed. Paid nurses, superintended by ladies, who were to be under the authority of the medical officers, were to be substituted for the pauper nurses then employed; and, in fact, such a general system of treatment for the sick poor was to be adopted as should be without parallel in the world.

Although, as a body, the unfortunate Guardians of the metropolitan poor attempted to carry out the orders of the Poor-law Board and the wishes of the public with perfect integrity, ill-fortune seemed still to follow them. Never was the familiar fable of the "Old Man and the Ass" more completely exemplified than in their case. By trying to please all, they pleased no one. The Poor-law Board first scolded them for

not carrying out their orders with greater alacrity. Severe as this infliction appeared, it was trifling in comparison to what was in store for them when they applied to the different Vestries for funds to carry out the orders they had received. They were now assailed by a burst of indignation from the ratepayers for what was termed their extravagance; and, although they had only carried out the orders of the Poor-law Board, they were as severely blamed for their want of sympathy with the struggling ratepayers, as they had formerly been for their want of sympathy with the sick poor. Indignation meetings were now held in different parts of the Metropolis, at which strong animadversions were passed on the reckless expenditure of the guardians, and inquiries were for the first time made as to the necessity for the different alterations ordered by the Poor-law Board, as well as to the enormous cost of the proposed sick asylums.

It must not be supposed that this display

of discontent on the part of the ratepayers arose from any want of sympathy with the poor. It solely arose from what they considered useless expenditure. Nor was their anger altogether without cause, or their suspicions unreasonable. Their attention was first called to the possibility of extravagant expenditure by the great increase in the poor's-rate; for, although in some parishes the local taxation was raised more severely than in others, all felt it acutely, coming, as it did, at a time of commercial stagnation, and therefore one of anxiety and difficulty to a vast majority of the ratepayers. Numerous inquiries were now made of the rate-collector as to the enormous increase in the local taxation, without, however, any very satisfactory explanation being obtained. In fact, it is more than probable that the collector, being himself a ratepayer, took occasion darkly to hint that the increase need not have been as great as it was, if the guardians had not given way too

readily to the demands of the Poor-law Board; and that very possibly if the ratepayers were even now to agitate the question with vigour, very considerable modifications might be made in the system about to be adopted, so as to lessen the proposed enormous increase in the taxation.

Meetings of ratepayers now began to be held in different parts of the Metropolis, not only to inquire how far the alterations proposed by the new Poor-law Board were needed, but also into the ability of the ratepayers to support the enormous increase they would occasion on their local taxation. On the latter point, it is hardly needful to say, that great unanimity of opinion prevailed alike in the poorer and richer parishes. The east-end districts, such as Shoreditch, Poplar, and Bethnal Green, proved to demonstration their utter inability to support greater burdens than were at present imposed upon them. They showed that every increase of rate was attended by an increase in the number of

paupers, and those generally from a class who had hitherto been ratepayers themselves; and that nothing was more frequent than for a summons to be issued against a tenant of a house for the poor's-rate, while a portion of its inmates were actually at the time receiving parochial relief. In the west-end parishes the complaints were equally loud, though on the whole their taxation was less in proportion to their means than it was in the eastern districts.

The guardians and ratepayers next began to inquire how far the radical changes proposed by Mr. Gathorne Hardy's Act were needed, and what would be the benefits to the poor if the clauses were carried out in their entirety. Many ratepayers now began to investigate the question more narrowly. They found that the average cost of a sick person in the most economically managed hospital in London was more than double that incurred in the workhouse infirmaries; and they now sought for the par-

ticular advantages the poor patients gained under hospital management—such, in fact, as was proposed to be carried out in the new sick asylums. Great were the difficulties, however, in the attempt to draw a comparison between the benefits received by a patient in a general hospital and those in a workhouse infirmary. At first sight the mortality appeared far greater in the general hospital than in the workhouse, but no conclusion as to their comparative merits could be drawn therefrom — the hospitals receiving principally acute cases, while in the workhouses the greater number of patients were suffering from chronic diseases. Consequently the mortality among the former was far greater in proportion to numbers than among the latter.

But, although no very definite conclusion could be drawn from a comparison between the ordinary cases in a general hospital and a workhouse infirmary, it was very different in reference to the lying-in wards of the medical

charities and those in the workhouse infirmaries. Here some very singular facts and figures presented themselves; so extraordinary, indeed, that were not "the inability of the guardians of the poor, the insufficiency of their medical officers, and their detestable system of nursing," accepted almost as articles of faith by the public, we should be led to conclude that the treatment adopted in the workhouse infirmaries was fully equal, if not superior, to that of the medical lying-in hospitals.

Of the different medical lying-in hospitals in London, the one which has fewest deaths among its patients, and whose medical officers are fully equal to those attached to any other medical lying-in institution, is the Queen Charlotte's Maternity Hospital, in the Marylebone Road. It is shown from their reports that even there the average mortality is at least three times that of the metropolitan workhouse infirmaries. The reports of the other medical lying-in charities are scarcely

so favourable, the mortality in more than one greatly exceeding that of Queen Charlotte's Hospital. In fact, when a balance is struck, it is found that the mortality in these institutions is at least *five* times greater than in the workhouse infirmaries. In the evidence of Dr. Edward Smith, printed in the report of the committee appointed by the House of Commons to consider the cubic space of the metropolitan workhouses, he says :—

"The records of this class of cases (midwifery) show that the mortality is less in workhouses than in any other institution of a considerable extent. It is six times less than that which occurs in the chief lying-in institutions in the Metropolis, and it is more than ten times less than occurs in the great lying-in institutions in Vienna and other large continental cities. To whatever cause may be attributed this agreeable fact, it seems a natural inference that, being such in workhouses, they may safely be continued."

In quoting Queen Charlotte's Hospital, it

should be noticed that, although its mortality is far in excess of workhouse infirmaries, it is the most favourable instance of sanitary condition and successful practice to be found among the medical lying-in charities. The managers of the hospital have made several attempts to account for its mortality,—their principal one being that of the patients confined in their hospital nearly one-half are single women, amongst whom deaths are far more frequent than amongst the married. This reason, however, is invalid, for in the workhouse infirmaries it is a sad fact that nearly nine-tenths of those confined in them are single women.

Again, if the science displayed by the medical officers and managers of lying-in hospitals is greater than that of the workhouse infirmaries, how is it that the more elaborate the science and the more liberal the cost lavished on the patient, the mortality should increase in almost equal proportion? The most economically managed charity of

the description is Queen Charlotte's Hospital, and the most munificent the late lying-in ward in King's College Hospital. In the latter, not only were the requirements of science carried out to their fullest extent, but the medical staff and nurses attached to it were considered among the most expert in London. Every appliance and arrangement that ingenuity could conceive was put in force to make this a model institution. When completed, and before being opened, many of its projectors were so proud of their handiwork that they invited the clergy and others interested in the welfare of the poor to inspect their arrangements; so that in case they were ever called to take part in the management of institutions of the kind, they might perfectly understand what plan was the best to be adopted. Greater ingenuity, or at any rate thought, than had been shown in the arrangement of these wards it would be difficult to imagine. The floor was of oak, as being considered less liable to absorb

organic matter, and the walls of the wards were prepared in such a manner as to keep them from absorbing any deleterious gases or substances which might tend to the detriment of the patients. Each woman was allowed some four thousand cubic feet of air to her bed, or about as much as is found in a good-sized dining-room.

The arrangements for warmth and ventilation were of the most costly and complicated description. Not only were the windows made to rise and fall as might be required, by a most ingenious apparatus, but three stoves were placed in the ward—one on the furthest side from the window, and one at each extremity—so as to ensure warmth without disturbing the atmosphere of the room. Lady nurses were appointed to superintend, while ordinary nurses were provided to carry out their orders, and every necessary for the lying-in room was furnished with the most lavish abundance. Unfortunately, the results were by no means commensurate with the

ingenuity and liberality of the arrangements. On the contrary, after the first four years the mortality was shown to be so great, that considerable anxiety arose in the minds of the medical officers, and doubts were entertained whether it would not be better to close the wards. This was not, however, allowed to be done. Fresh and still more complicated arrangements were adopted to make the sanitary condition perfect; but, alas! with no better result than before. Alterations were now made which were deemed to be infallible, and it was asserted positively that science would triumph. During the next two years the wards continued open; but, unfortunately, the mortality, so far from diminishing, rose to one in fifteen of the gross number of the patients. So alarming was this considered, that the medical officers unanimously insisted that the wards should be closed; and the hospital no longer receives lying-in cases.

Let me now draw a comparison between

some of the best-managed workhouse infirmaries and the model wards in King's College Hospital. During the six years that the latter were open, the mortality appears to have averaged about one in twenty-three. In eleven of the metropolitan workhouse infirmaries, comprising Bermondsey, Chelsea, Clerkenwell, Fulham, St. James's Westminster, Kensington, Lewisham, St. Luke's, St. Margaret's Westminster, Mile End Old Town, and Stepney, there was not *one death* in 2,413 deliveries during the same period; and in fourteen metropolitan workhouses, where the mortality was the greatest, the deaths were considerably less than one-half of those in Queen Charlotte's Hospital, which latter, as before stated, has a smaller mortality than any other medical charity of the description in London. I will not attempt to give any reasons for this excess of mortality in the medical charities over the workhouse infirmaries. I simply judge of the tree by its fruits, and conclude that in the eleven

workhouse infirmaries where not one death had occurred, the science displayed by the parish medical officers, the arrangements made by the Boards of Guardians, and the general character of the nursing, cannot have been inferior to that shown in King's College, the British Lying-in, or Queen Charlotte's Hospitals.*

Let me now draw another contrast, and assume that in the medical charities there was not one death in some 2,500 cases, while one in twenty-three took place in the workhouse infirmaries. Would not the managers of the Lying-in Hospitals then point proudly to what are called the advantages of medical science, administered by medical men of the highest reputation, and deprecate in the severest manner the heartless indifference of the guardians of the poor for not having adopted their system, fraught as it was with

* It may be interesting to the advocates for the admission of ladies into the medical profession to know that the patients confined in the workhouse infirmaries are attended by women.

such beneficial results? Yet the contrary was the case; and, while the Poor-law infirmaries were assailed with every sort of abuse for their want of consideration for the sick poor, not one term of reproach was cast on the staff of the hospitals for the enormous mortality which had taken place under their management. It has lately been held by Dr. Lankester and other medical authorities, and very justly endorsed by public opinion, that every death in the workhouse infirmaries, even where no suspicion of unkindness or want of proper attention exist, should nevertheless have rigid investigation, or a coroner's inquest called to inquire into the matter. Yet I do not remember one instance of a coroner's inquest having been called to investigate the cause of any one of the vast proportion of deaths which took place in the lying-in wards of King's College Hospital, or any other maternity hospital in the Metropolis.

Let me now return to the sick asylums, and endeavour to show the necessity, before others

are built, of inquiring into their cost, as well as their construction. The ratepayers should refuse to sanction any fresh erection unless the absolute necessity for such is proved, and they should see that the arrangements be such as in their common-sense judgment are requisite for the purpose. Among the crotchets taken up by the Poor-law Board and its advisers one appears to be, that the greater the expenditure, the greater *must* be the corresponding advantage to the poor. That this is not the case as far as regards the building is easily proved. I have already shown that the sanitary condition of Queen Charlotte's Lying-in Hospital is the most satisfactory of the maternity hospitals; the lying-in ward in King's College Hospital, the least so. And yet, in Queen Charlotte's Hospital the cost of the building averaged £37 for each bed, while the proportionate cost of beds in the lying-in wards of King's College Hospital, taking into consideration the number of cubic feet allowed to each bed,

could scarcely have been less than £500. Again, it appears just that, before these sick asylums are built at the enormous cost frequently proposed, it should be clearly ascertained whether the principles on which they are to be erected would be beneficial to the patients, and whether their method of ventilation is better than that at present in use in the workhouse infirmaries. The Poor-law Board appear to consider that the greater the amount of cubic air, the more perfect shall be the ventilation. At the same time it is only justice to Dr. Edward Smith, the well-known medical Poor-law inspector, to admit that he has invariably maintained that, although a necessary amount of atmospheric air should be given to each bed, the sanitary condition of the ward should depend more on its scrupulous cleanliness, and the constant admission of a current of pure air, than on the amount of cubic space allotted to each bed. In his evidence before the committee, he says:—"The mortality is dependent on other conditions

98431

than the cubical space; nay, that it is quite independent of it may be inferred from a statement prepared by a member of the committee, which shows that the first workhouse on the list has 7,000 cubic feet to each bed, and yet lost by death one in 72 cases; while the last on the list, having less than 800 cubic feet of air for each bed, lost but one in 150."

It may be said that I have hitherto only spoken of the management of lying-in cases, leaving untouched that of general diseases; but, as before stated, midwifery cases are the only ones in which a perfect comparison may be drawn between the medical charities and workhouse infirmaries; the hospital management and ventilation, properly so called, being more difficult in lying-in wards than any other class of cases whatever. All are aware of the terrible and fatal effects of puerperal fever in the wards of lying-in hospitals; in fact, among no other class of patients is so terrible an enemy to be dreaded. In more than one of the metropolitan hospi-

tals, typhus fever and hospital gangrene, arising from defective ventilation, has occasionally broken out, but the consequent mortality has been trifling indeed (proportionate numbers being taken into consideration), in comparison with those which have occurred in the lying-in charities. In one of the latter it has been found that no fewer than twenty-three cases of puerperal fever occurred in nine months. In the lying-in wards of the Kensington workhouse, one of the largest in London, there has not been one case in twenty-three years. Notwithstanding this favourable state of affairs, they were ordered, as soon as the new law came into force, to give up to the Poor-law Board the control of their sick; and they were, moreover, ordered, in conjunction with the parishes of St. Margaret's and St. John's, Westminster, to build a sick asylum apart from their workhouses, which, from the estimates given, and including the cost of the land, would not have been less than £250 for

each bed it was intended to hold, and which was to comprise a staff of at least sixty officials, where half-a-dozen at most were then efficiently performing the same duties.

A short description of this asylum, as intended to have been built, may not be uninteresting to the ratepayer, as it will assist him in contrasting the amount of good to be effected with the amount of cost proposed to be expended in obtaining it. It was estimated that the apartments of the physician, the surgeon, and superior officials would, on the whole, have cost as much as a first-class mansion in Belgrave Square. I have not by me the exact description of each, but I will contrast that of the surgeon with the residence of the house surgeon of an average metropolitan hospital—say Westminster. In the latter establishment, the house surgeon has a bed-room and sitting-room allowed for his own private use, and his meals are taken at the same table with the other superior officials. In the sick asylum, the assistant

surgeon was to have allotted to him a dining and drawing-room, library, bath-room, and six bed-rooms. The apartments of the physicians and other superior officials were even on a more liberal scale. The mere value of house-rent for the extra staff and officials of the asylum would have far exceeded the full salaries which were then being paid to the whole of the medical officers whose labours were being performed in so efficient a manner.

The arrangements for the patients themselves were quite as lavish as those of the staff, and the whole elevation of the building, as proposed by the plan submitted to the Board of Guardians, had far more the appearance of a palace than of an asylum for the poor. Fortunately, however, the indignation of the population of Westminster and Kensington was expressed in so emphatic a manner at this needless expenditure, that the Poor-law Board agreed, on certain conditions, to rescind the order. One of these conditions was to the effect that the parish of Kensington

should build a sick asylum, to the satisfaction of the Poor-law Board, on a piece of waste ground near their workhouse. This was agreed to, and the new infirmary, a handsome Elizabethan structure, has been erected and approved of by the Board at a cost of £73 a bed, or about one-third of the cost proposed to be expended on the asylum. The then President of the Poor-law Board, Lord Devon, insisted that this was not one shilling more than was necessary for the erection of a building of the kind.

But apart from the unnecessary cost to the ratepayer for these asylums, it is doubtful whether the lavish manner in which they are being carried out does not occasionally have a very demoralising effect on the poor themselves. The increase in the expenditure in medical relief of the poor seems occasionally to become a premium to the working classes to turn paupers, thereby destroying one of the noblest attributes in their character—the spirit of self-dependence. In one of the east-

end parishes, where great improvements have been made for the accommodation of lying-in women, I was informed by one of the parish medical officers that the number of pauper lying-in cases had in the last three years more than trebled, and that many of the applicants are now of a class who a few years since would have shuddered at the idea of applying for parish relief in their time of trouble.

And here, again, a very strong contrast may be drawn between the condition of the wife of the poor and honest ratepayer and the profligate female pauper. It has been calculated that an intelligent, hard-working artisan spends on his wife's confinement about 40*s*. When the Poor-law regulations are fully carried out in the wealthier parishes, it is calculated that the sum of £3 will be expended on every woman who may enter the asylum to be confined of her illegitimate child. On the recovery of the artisan's wife, he may be able to expend on an average the

sum of 3*s.* a week on his child before he is able to assist in earning his own livelihood; but should the woman who had been confined in the asylum, after her recovery think fit to desert her illegitimate child, it will be brought up at the expense of the ratepayer at the cost of 10*s.* a week; and the artisan, who can with difficulty afford to spend a quarter of that sum on his own child, is obliged, directly or indirectly, to contribute to the maintenance of the woman's child in the union schools. Altogether, the subject is full of anomalies. No working man, and few small tradesmen, are able to expend as much in a case of sickness or for the maintenance of their children as is at present spent on the offspring of our paupers.

CHAPTER V.

SICK ASYLUMS AND HOSPITALS (*continued*).

NOR is the care taken of the sick children in the pauper schools less costly than that bestowed upon the adults in the workhouse infirmaries. It would occupy too much space to go with any minuteness into the question. I will content myself with giving an example of the care habitually bestowed upon them. And here, again, a strong contrast may be shown in the amount of attention and expenditure lavished in the pauper schools, and the amount spent on establishments of the kind for children of the middle class, or even of those held in highest estimation by the public;—for decidedly the care bestowed on our sick pauper children is at

least equal to that in our first-class public schools.

Some five years since an outbreak of ophthalmia occurred in the City union schools at Hanwell. So severe was it that the then resident medical officer was unable to cope with it single-handed. The committee of management, selected from the guardians of the different unions subscribing to the schools, immediately determined on inviting a certain oculist of the highest celebrity (though his celebrity was not higher than his skill and humanity deserved) to meet in consultation the resident medical officer of the establishment, and to visit with him the unfortunate children attacked by the disease. For this consultation the oculist was to receive a fee of £50. He gave it as his decided opinion that the greatest care and skill were necessary to arrest the spread of the disease; and as this would occasion a vast amount of scientific manipulation, three assistants were engaged at, as I was informed, a salary

of three guineas a week each, to assist the resident medical officer, while the eminent oculist himself was to visit the establishment whenever he thought necessary, receiving a fee of ten guineas for each visit. By great care and attention the disease was got under, and the oculist gave the committee of management a clean bill of health.

When the oculist took his leave, the committee, anxious to prevent another outbreak of the disease, inquired if he could suggest any plan they could adopt in order to avoid a similar occurrence among the children in the schools. After complimenting the committee for the great care and attention they paid to the poor children under their charge, he admitted that he was unable to point out any radical defect in the management. "One thing occurs to me," he continued, "which, if it were possible to alter, might be advisable. I noticed that the soil in the back playground is somewhat of a dusty nature, and

if means could be taken to remedy this it possibly might be advantageous to the children. Their constitutions are, as a rule, congenitally weak, and have been in many instances made worse by their habits of life previous to being admitted into the institution. They are therefore more likely than healthy children to contract ophthalmic diseases." The committee of management thanked the doctor for his advice, and they appointed a day when they should again meet to take into consideration the practicability of carrying out his suggestion. At last they resolved upon a plan, and gave an order, at a cost considerably exceeding £3,000, to cover the whole surface of the back playground with Yorkshire stone (such as is used for street pathways), so that not a particle of dust could possibly rise when the children were amusing themselves, and thereby any danger of ophthalmia from that cause would for the future be avoided.

The attention paid to the comfort and

sanitary condition of the boys in our large public schools is undoubtedly very great, but I would ask the reader if he, in his experience, remembers either at Eton, Harrow, Rugby, or Winchester, any instance that can show a greater amount of liberality, solicitude, and care than that exhibited by the committee of management at the metropolitan schools at Hanwell? And yet one of the principal movers in this liberal—perhaps the reader may consider too liberal—outlay of money to arrest the spread of ophthalmia in Hanwell schools, was one of those who was afterwards held up to the execration of the public for his want of liberality to the poor.

It may now fairly be asked, If this extreme care and attention be paid to the sick poor, how was it that so many distressing instances were brought a few years since under the notice of the public? In reply, I would submit that the guardians are no more infallible in their judgment than the managers of hospitals. At the same time, it might be a

question whether the admission of ladies into the Boards of Guardians would not have a very beneficial effect. In the first place, they would be able to detect irregularities which it would be obvious the male guardians are morally unable to do, and yet are severely blamed when these irregularities are brought under the notice of the public. I will mention two cases in point.

In the report of the *Lancet* Commissioners (I think on the Shoreditch workhouse) it was stated that in the lying-in wards, on drawing down the bed-clothes of one of the patients, the sheets were found to be in a very soiled condition. The other instance took place on the occasion of a visit of inspection made by the guardians to the pauper children in one of the district schools. The wives of two of these gentlemen expressed a wish to accompany them, and permission being accorded, they went with the guardians over the whole of the building. The schools were narrowly examined, the state of the bedrooms and

quality of the food rigidly inquired into, and the inspection passed off most satisfactorily. The guardians then retired to their room to consult on future operations, and the ladies, being left by themselves, determined to revisit the female portion of the schools. Notwithstanding the satisfactory and cleanly external appearance of the girls, on turning up their frocks their under-clothing was discovered to be both ragged and dirty. Now, it must be clear to the reader that in either of these cases it would be impossible for the male guardians to have made the discovery, or to have taken the means for doing so. That the physician acting for the *Lancet* might do this, with that delicacy and tact peculiar to the profession, without animadversion, is true; but it would not have been possible for the non-professional male guardian to have done the same without (and in his case very justly) being severely reproached for his conduct.

In the distribution of municipal charity, England stands alone in her refusal to admit

ladies into the Boards of Guardians. In all other European cities they are considered among the most efficient almoners, being not only better able to judge of the absolute requirements of women and children than the male guardians, but by their tact they discover with far greater facility the female impostor—the most dangerous and troublesome class the Poor-law authorities have to deal with.

Another alteration in the organization of our metropolitan Boards of Guardians would be advantageous—I mean, the presence among them of some of the more intelligent and respectable artisan class. Two benefits would be derived from their admission: they would be better able to point out the really deserving poor, as well as to detect the impostor. It might be imagined that were they allowed a voice in the distribution of the poor's-rate, they would dispense it too lavishly and recklessly. Of this, however, there would be but little danger. Any one who has had the

opportunity of remarking the tact and justice with which the benefit funds of the different Trades' Unions are administered will bear me out when I say that, while the really deserving are treated with great kindness and sympathy, there is not a class in society that has less pity on the idler and impostor.

But to return to the sick poor. Admitting without further demur that no greater sum than is absolutely necessary is expended on the sick poor in the Metropolis—a statement much to be doubted—the question arises, Whether we are still not paying a vast deal more than we need do, were the funds of our great metropolitan hospitals administered with discretion and economy. And here let me be understood not in any manner to allude to hospitals lately established, but solely to those endowed in bygone ages for the benefit of the Metropolis at large, whose original endowments all correspond, in greater or less degree, with the present pauper sick asylums of London. I allude

especially to St. Thomas's, St. Bartholomew's, Christ's, Bridewell, and Bethlem Hospitals. I will commence with that of St. Thomas's.

As the reader is aware, St. Thomas's Hospital remained in its original site in the Borough till it was purchased, a few years since, at a heavy cost, by the Charing Cross Railway Company. The sale having been decided on, a site had to be found for the new hospital. A strong difference of opinion appears for some time to have existed among the authorities on this subject. Some of the trustees urged that the site for the new building ought to be in some portion of the Metropolis as near as possible to the City, where the population was densest, and hospital accommodation smallest. Some outsiders, as well as City authorities also, gave it as their opinion that the west-end of the town was far better supplied with hospital accommodation than the east; that for the enormous population of the Borough and the districts stretching eastward there would be

only one general hospital (Guy's), which was totally insufficient for the population, and especially as the districts of Woolwich, Greenwich, Deptford, Walworth, and other localities were in the habit of sending their serious cases to St. Thomas's and Guy's Hospitals; that when both of them were together they were always full to overflowing; and that to remove one to the west-end of the town, as was proposed by some of the trustees, would be to deprive a large portion of the population of advantages they had hitherto received. How scant is at present the hospital accommodation in the south-eastern districts may be realised from the fact that the poor girl who was found nearly murdered in a lane near Eltham, and whose case caused so much sensation in the public mind a short time since, had to be carried, at the point of death, sitting erect, in a common street cab, ten miles before she could reach Guy's Hospital. Again, it was urged that in the north-eastern districts of the Metropolis, with a population

exceeding six hundred thousand souls, there was not one general hospital, with the exception of that known as the German Hospital at Dalston—a fact to be found paralleled in no other city in Europe.

On the other hand, the majority of the trustees were of opinion that the hospital had better be removed westward; and, ignoring the fact that the western districts already possessed Westminster, St. George's, Middlesex, Charing Cross, King's College, St. Mary's Paddington, besides several smaller and special hospitals, it was decided that the new St. Thomas's Hospital should be erected opposite the Houses of Parliament. It would be difficult to discover any plausible reason for such a course. The strongest argument which appears to have been made use of in favour of the removal was that the physicians and surgeons attached to St. Thomas's Hospital were among the most expert and learned in the Metropolis; and that, as with many of them minutes were as guineas, it was not to

be supposed they would habitually visit the still further east or north-eastern districts, great as their charity and humanity might be. It was urged that even the distant site of the old St. Thomas's Hospital was a strain on their good nature, and that to visit the sick and wounded at a greater distance would be too great a burden on their philanthropy. Without in any manner whatever disputing the admirable skill and humanity of the medical officers attached to St. Thomas's Hospital, I have not the slightest hesitation in stating that the whole ability of the medical profession in London is not confined to the staff of two or three of our hospitals; that there is as much ability among other members of the profession in London, whose names are scarcely ever heard beyond the poor parishes in which they live, and whose only impediment to celebrity and fortune is that the class of their patients is not so aristocratic as that under care of the doctors of some of our larger hospitals. Had

the new St. Thomas's Hospital been built in the neighbourhood of Walworth, Shoreditch, or Haggerstone, and the present medical staff found it inconvenient or impossible to attend to it, medical men of as much skill, if not as much eminence, might have been found in the immediate vicinity—that is to say, if the success attending their cases should be considered a test of their ability.

But to return to St. Thomas's Hospital. The site having been determined on, it was purchased of the Metropolitan Board of Works for the sum of £95,000, to which £5,000 was afterwards added for the roadway. Some have severely criticised the Metropolitan Board of Works for disposing of so valuable a spot of ground for so small a sum; while others consider that they were perfectly justified in so doing, inasmuch as it would hardly have been commendable in them to have driven too hard a bargain with so excellent a charity. The selection of the site and the plans having been approved of

by the Lord Chancellor, the building began, and it is now finished. But a question has arisen in the minds of many, whether the sum expended in its erection might not have been applied with greater advantage to both the sick poor of the Metropolis and to the ratepayers? The buildings, by the original contract, were estimated to cost about £330,000, the site and roadway £100,000 more. With furnishing, &c., the hospital will thus certainly not cost less than half a million of money. It is stated by those who defend the erection of the present building that it will hardly reach that sum; while the report is generally current among the building trades that when the bill for alterations and other expenses is sent in, it will largely exceed it. The hospital is intended to contain six hundred beds. Say when the wards are open for patients the whole expense will not have exceeded £480,000, it will thus cost on an average £800 for every bed the building will hold. My own opinion is that it will largely

exceed that sum, and others maintain that it will more probably reach £1,000.

The reader may form some idea of what this amount really is from the following contrast. Were it possible, it would be more advantageous for each patient in a hospital to have a separate room; but as this would be far too costly a process in a public charity, wards, containing a greater or lesser number of beds, are, for the purpose of economy, used instead. Perhaps the better plan would be to estimate the cost of space for each bed to be equal to that of a room in a good dwelling-house, and the reader will then understand, even at the lowest estimate of £800 per bedroom, what class of houses might have been built for the money. Let us take, as an example, a first-class Belgrave Square mansion, containing twenty bedrooms, and the whole fitted up in a most perfect manner. I was informed by two eminent builders at the west-end, that the erection of such a mansion would cost perhaps £10,000; add £2,000 more as the cost of the

freehold, making altogether £12,000. Assume then that each of the bedrooms in a given number of houses is allotted to the use of a patient in St. Thomas's Hospital, and it will be found that the cost of house-rent will be at least a third less than that they will incur in the new hospital when filled. Should the number of patients admitted be no higher than at present in the hospital (about 400) the cost will be far more than double.

But it may be said, in estimating the cost of St. Thomas's at £800 per bed, I do not take into consideration that the new building will contain vast accommodation for out-patients, officers, officers' dwellings, medical schools, &c. Admitting this to be true, I may state, on the other hand, that in taking the cost of the mansion at so much per bedroom, I have not taken into consideration the other portions of the establishment, such as dining and drawing-rooms, library, and morning-rooms, the whole complicated basement, with its expensive fittings, fixtures, and joiners' work, with

the square and garden in front for the exercise of the patients, besides many other advantages; and the contrast cannot be stigmatised as an invidious one.

There is one item in the cost of St. Thomas's Hospital, however, far greater than the cost of the Belgrave Square mansion—the cement on the walls. This in the hospital being of Parian cement, is at least double the price per square yard of the cement on the walls of any private first-class dwelling in London. The medical officers considered it necessary, and the managers very properly agreed to the expenditure. I may state, however, that a strong opinion is rising in the minds of many of the medical profession, that the value of Parian cement, in a sanitary point of view, is exceedingly doubtful. Nay, some even go so far as to say that, unless the wards are ventilated in the most perfect manner (which is certainly not the case in the new hospital), the old lime-white was far preferable. If it absorbed organic matter, it

neutralised it to a considerable extent, while the Parian cement is apt to reflect it back again into the ward.

Another serious item in the cost of St. Thomas's Hospital is the medical schools' buildings. On these, it is said, has been expended at least £30,000, without taking into consideration the value of the land. The Lord Chancellor, however, has sanctioned this expenditure, and the wisdom of a decision in the Court of Chancery, of course, cannot be disputed. He appears to have admitted that the medical school was the property of the professors (although not a word on the subject existed in the original charter), and that they had a right to buildings proportionate to the expenditure incurred in the erection of the hospital. Now, the sum named (£30,000) does not include the cost of the site, which has been shown to be about twenty to twenty-five per cent. of the cost of the building. This will raise, even at the most moderate calculation, the gross cost of the schools to £35,000

or £40,000. It has been argued, that if the school-buildings were erected for the accommodation of the same number as are at present in attendance in the hospital, at the same proportionate cost as the medical schools attached to St. George's, Westminster, and Charing Cross Hospitals, the new building at St. Thomas's might have been erected at a cost of from £5,000 to £6,000. This would leave a balance from the sum sufficient to build economically another hospital of from 250 to 300 beds. Should the reader imagine that this excess of expenditure has been in any way necessary to benefit the sick poor, he is certainly in error; if, that is to say, the amount of benefit obtained in a hospital may be judged by the proportion of the cures to that of the number of cases admitted.

In a former chapter I attempted to draw a comparison between the mortality in the lying-in wards of the workhouse infirmaries and those in our first-class medical charities;

and, judging from the success attending the former, there must have been at least as much skill shown in them as in those superintended by physicians celebrated for their skill in obstetric practice. I will now draw a comparison between the success attending the treatment of surgical cases in a first-class hospital—say St. George's, St. Mary's, or St. Thomas's—with that of the poorest hospital in London. And there will be another feature in this contrast well worth noting. The three hospitals I have mentioned are those in the extreme western portion of the Metropolis, whilst the one with which the contrast will be made is in the extreme east — Poplar Hospital. I have already shown that the practice of parish surgeons is, in the case of females, quite equal in skill to that of first-class physicians; and I will now prove, by an equally strong contrast, that surgical talent is not solely confined to the west-end or great hospitals, but, if the cause may be judged by its effects, there is as much

talent among the medical practitioners of Blackwall, Poplar, and Limehouse, as in St. George's Hanover Square, or Savile Row. This contrast will have another feature worthy of the special attention of the ratepayer, as it will prove to him (assuming that he believes the public at large have a right to some interest in the management of St. Thomas's and St. Bartholomew's Hospitals) that an enormous expenditure in a building where every medical crotchet is carried out to the fullest extent, is little more than a useless and reprehensible waste of money.

For many years the only hospital in the eastern portion of the Metropolis was the London. This, as the reader is doubtless aware, is an admirably managed institution; the medical and surgical staff are men of highest ability; the governors and managers men of tact and humanity. But in this hospital a very great inconvenience was felt from the many serious accidents which occurred in the East and West India Docks. These had to

be carried to a great distance before relief could be afforded them, increasing the torture of the patient, and diminishing the chances of recovery; and this objection was still further increased when the Victoria Dock was opened. Many of the shipbuilders and manufacturers in the district—among them Messrs. Green, Wigram, Ravenhill, and others—now began to entertain the question whether it would not be possible to establish a hospital somewhere in the neighbourhood of Poplar. The scheme at first met with but little success, the hackneyed argument being used that men of experience could not be found in the neighbourhood, that surgeons of eminence would not journey so far east, and that it would be far better for the patient, even if his sufferings were increased thereby, to be carried to the London Hospital.

But the gentlemen who started the idea were men of a practical turn of mind, and did not admit the objection. Their reasons were simple in the extreme, and the result has

proved that they were correct. To the objection raised that the principal medical men in the district were merely general practitioners, keeping open dispensaries, and incapable of attending to the serious accidents which would be brought under their notice, they argued that many of them — possibly the majority—had formerly served as surgeons on board merchant-ships, and if they were capable of attending scientifically and humanely to accidents which occurred at sea, they would be equally competent to treat the same class of accidents on land. They were, moreover, supported to a certain extent in their decision by Government, which made over to them the old Blackwall Custom House—a building, according to modern views, utterly unadapted for the purpose—as a hospital. Subscriptions were raised, some beds and apparatus purchased, some general practitioners in the neighbourhood, who had served at sea, were appointed as surgeons, and the hospital was opened. And what has been the result?

This charity, small as it is, containing possibly scarcely more than thirty beds, in an edifice so inexpensive that even at the present high price of building materials it will not have cost more than £30 a bed,* receives a greater number of serious accidents than any three of the west-end hospitals put together, more possibly than even the London Hospital; and the success attending their operations and cures is to the full as satisfactory as in any other in the Metropolis. In the year 1871 they received 262 in-patients, and treated 2,512 out-patients—all surgical cases. Of operations and amputations of different descriptions, including those of the thumb and finger, they had no less than fifty-two; seven cases of ligature of the principal arteries, more than 1,000 wounds and lacerations, nearly 800 contusions; twelve fractures of the skull, six of which were compound; fifty-one other fractures, nine of which were of the

* Compare this sum with the £800 or £1,000 per bed of St. Thomas's Hospital.

humerus; twenty-four of the fore-arm; twelve of the thigh-bone, two of them compound; and many others equally serious. And yet, notwithstanding this large number of surgical cases, comprising more wounded than occurs in many battle-fields, during the year 1871 there were only fourteen deaths. Of these, five died from the serious nature of their wounds a few hours after admission, and eight before the close of the following day. Nor is this result the only gratifying feature we have to record in the administration of this hospital. Objectionable as it may appear in the eyes of the designers, advisers, and architects of St. Thomas's Hospital, and several of the newly-erected pauper sick asylums, not one death was caused during the whole year in the Poplar Hospital by erysipelas or pyæmia — a fact which certainly cannot be surpassed, if equalled, in St. Thomas's, the largest medical institution in the Metropolis.

Before quitting this hospital it may also

be stated, to the disgrace of the wealthy community of London, that it is the worst supported in the Metropolis. Had it not been for several of the large shipbuilding firms, who feel an interest in the misfortunes of their poorer fellow-creatures, among whom may especially be mentioned Messrs. Green, Wigram, Bullivant, and others, it is more than probable this most useful building would have been closed. But in the subscriptions a singular contrast may be drawn between the charitable feelings of the wealthy and those of the poorer classes. The working men in the yards of Messrs. Green, Wigram, Dudgeon, Bullivant, Blundel, Samuda, and others, subscribe out of their small earnings no less a sum than £126 per annum — probably more than all Lombard Street put together.

It must not for a moment be imagined that I would, even with its great economy, admit that such a building as that at Poplar is fit for the purpose of a general hospital.

But I am fully persuaded that one much better adapted could be erected, as shown in Kensington, for a sum not exceeding £70 a bed. Nor is the one at Poplar sufficiently large for the neighbourhood. But the funds in the hands of the governors are quite inadequate to construct another on a larger scale; and as the illiberality of the merchant community of London, who benefit so much by the artisans and labourers in our docks and shipbuilding yards, allows slight hope of a change for the better, the present inapplicable building must continue to be used for the purpose, although it affords not a tenth part of the accommodation for the wounded which is required in the neighbourhood.

CHAPTER VI.

SICK ASYLUMS AND HOSPITALS (*continued*).

THE other hospital which may properly be called one of the sick asylums of the Metropolis, is that of St. Bartholomew's. A proof of the intention of its original charter may be found in the 36th of the reign of Henry VIII. The Letters Patent, after stating that, although the monastery had been dissolved, yet for the future the charitable purposes for which it was founded should be continued, the king "desiring nothing more* than that the true works of piety and charity should not be abolished there, but rather fully restored and renewed according to the primitive pattern of their general sincerity, and

* Translation of the Letters Patent, 23rd June, 1544.

their abuses of the foundation of the same hospital in lapse of time lamentably occurring, being reformed, have endeavoured, as far as human infirmity will permit, that henceforth there be comfort for the prisoner, shelter to the poor, visitation to the sick, food for the hungry, drink to the thirsty, clothes to the naked, and sepulture to the dead, administered there, and that other works of piety be performed there to the glory of Almighty God, and to the common utility and happiness of our subjects."

By this it would appear that the original establishment of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, after the Reformation, was simply and purely the same as a workhouse in the present day. If further proof were needed to establish the parochial or pauper character of St. Bartholomew's, it may be found in the Deed of Covenant between King Henry VIII. and the Mayor, Commonalty, and Citizens of London, respecting the hospitals, dated 27th December, 1546, in which it is related that—

"Our said Sovereign Lord the King is pleased and contented that the said late hospital of St. Bartholomew's shall from henceforth be a place and house for the relief and sustentation of poor people, and shall be called the House of the Poore in West Smithfield, in the suburbs of the City of London, of King Henry the eighth's foundation."

It would occupy too much space to go at all into the history of St. Bartholomew's Hospital. Till it became what in the present meaning of the word "hospital" is termed an asylum for the sick and wounded, there is no document whatever to show any divergence from its original intention of being one of the general hospitals or municipal sick asylums of London. It is in the interest, therefore, of every ratepayer, that the original intention and uses of this hospital should be restored; for it must be remembered that in the first shadowings of the Poor-law, in the time of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., the citizens were

positively taxed for the maintenance of this and other Royal hospitals. St. Bartholomew's was, in fact, one of the first hospitals supported by a rate levied on the citizens, beyond its endowments. In the year 1548 an act was passed by the Common Council for assessing the City Companies in the sum of 500 marks, to be paid annually to St. Bartholomew's Hospital. Again, in 1557, in "the order of the hospitals of King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI.," St. Bartholomew's, Christ's, Bridewell, and St. Thomas's are named as forming what in the present day may be called the City Poor-law establishments.

That St. Bartholomew's Hospital has hitherto been of incalculable service to the Metropolis there can be no doubt, and it is so indisputably to the present day; but the question is, whether these uses may not be considerably extended both to the benefit of the sick poor and of the ratepayer? To the ratepayer, inasmuch as its funds might benefit

a far greater number of patients than it now does; while to the sick poor it is more than questionable whether its uses have not somewhat diminished as its funds have increased. I may be answered that never were there a greater number of patients applying to the hospital for relief than at the present time. But that does not affect the truth of my assertion. During the first twenty years of the present century, St. Bartholomew's Hospital stood in a densely populated district, and was of immense benefit and use in the immediate neighbourhood. By degrees, however, what are called civic improvements began to be carried out. The inhabitants of the neighbourhood around it were adjudged to be of the most demoralised description, their dwellings unhealthy, and in fact unfit for habitation.' Then commenced the destruction of the dwellings of the poor from Fleet Market to Clerkenwell; nor did it cease till some 35,000 of the inhabitants were driven away, without the slightest con-

sideration on the part of the civic authorities as to where they were to find shelter. Indeed, so ruthlessly was the system carried out that at last public indignation was aroused, and strong animadversions were passed upon the civic authorities for their want of humanity to the poor. For some time little attention was paid to these complaints, but public indignation increased to such a height that at last, unwilling as they were, the Corporation could close their ears to it no longer. To give the reader a correct idea of the magnitude of the destruction of the dwellings of the poor in the neighbourhood and the civic philanthropy, it will be as well to quote the words of the late Charles Pearson, extracted from the minutes of the Common Council, March 7, 1861 :—

"The noble street improvements," he said, "undertaken by the Corporation have swept, and are about to sweep away, thousands of industrious artisans and mechanics from their humble dwellings, to make way for the spa-

cious streets and splendid warehouses destined in this age of progress to take their place. *To supply the lack of dwellings these wholesale clearances create, the Corporation have recently voted a large sum to purchase land and erect lodging-houses in the vicinity of Victoria Street.* This took place nine years ago. Indignation died away, and philanthropists were soothed. The City had promised—nay, voted—the money, and I may add procured the site. But having waited until it might be hoped the pledge would be forgotten, *the Corporation of London, in place of building the lodging-houses, has just sold the land at a very enhanced price to a railway company for warehouses.*"

Altogether, it is supposed that in Farringdon Street alone no fewer than 40,000 working people, from whom a great proportion of the patients of St. Bartholomew's Hospital were recruited, were driven away. In other parts of the City, where the poor were most crowded, they were ejected to even

a greater extent. The greater portion among them — when Farringdon Street was destroyed—took refuge in the neighbourhood of Cannon Street and Holborn, to be as near the scene of their labours as possible; and these again were driven from their homes by further improvements, and New Cannon Street was formed. Since then the Holborn Viaduct and other improvements have contributed to lessen the population in the neighbourhood of St. Bartholomew's Hospital. Few persons save those who have gone somewhat deeply into the matter can imagine the hardship caused to the poor by these ejectments. Not only were they driven from their dwellings, but obstacles were positively thrown in way of their being allowed to return. Of these I could give many cases in point; one, however, must suffice.

Some eleven years since a poor woman applied as an out-patient at St. Bartholomew's Hospital for relief, complaining of

bleeding of the gums and several other distressing symptoms. She was, moreover, in an excessive state of emaciation, arising evidently from want of sufficient nourishment, and even the common necessaries of life. Seeing her lamentable condition, the physician said to her—

"My good woman, are you in comfortable circumstances at home? Because you ought to live well."

"Far from it, sir," she replied; "I'm starving."

"Then it is no use your coming here as an out-patient. You had better come as an in-patient, and I will order a bed to be prepared for you."

The woman objected, and at length the physician said to her—

"I will not press the matter on you any further. Remain as an out-patient if you please; but remember, that if you come into the hospital you will no doubt be cured; whereas if you attend as an out-patient, the

probabilities are that you will die. Now, take your choice."

The poor woman, after a moment's hesitation, agreed to come into the hospital, and was sent up to one of the wards. Late at night, however, she rose from her bed, and commenced to dress herself.

"What are you doing?" inquired the sister of the ward.

"I'm going home," she replied.

"Nonsense; you can't go home at this time of night. Get into your bed again."

"I must and will go home," said the woman, continuing to dress herself.

The sister immediately applied to one of the medical officers on duty to interfere, and he asked the woman what made her wish to go home.

"I've five children in my room at home; they've no food, and their father won't be home to-night," she replied.

The argument was of course unanswerable. The poor woman was supplied with wine and

other necessaries to take with her, and allowed to leave the hospital.

A few days afterwards the chaplain of the hospital, while in conversation with the incumbent of one of the parishes in the neighbourhood of Cannon Street, told him of the case.

"I am very sorry," was the reply, "that I do not have that poor woman in my parish. I have several wealthy district charities, and no poor to relieve. The formation of Cannon Street first destroyed one-half my parish, and another improvement has since taken away the greater portion of the remainder, and I have no poor left. I applied to the City authorities for permission to build a model lodging-house, volunteering to find the funds, and to superintend it myself; but they refused my application for a piece of ground, on the plea that they had got rid of the working classes, and it would be bad policy to invite them back again."

That this was no inconsiderate answer

may be judged from the fact that in the agreements and leases for those splendid offices, warehouses, and places of business in Cannon Street and its neighbourhood, clauses are inserted to the effect that no one shall be allowed to sleep on the premises, thereby not only avoiding the inhabited house duty, but effectually barring the return of any of the working classes to the City.

The City population in 1772 was about 100,000 souls more than in the present day. Afterwards it greatly augmented as trade increased, till the present improvements commenced. And what is the result? It would appear by the last census that the City proper has some 120,000 fewer of the working classes residing in it than it had at the latter part of the last century. It may be said that a great portion of these were driven over to the Surrey side of the water; but fresh improvements have again ejected them. Let us imagine, then, the case of

those who apply to St. Bartholomew's Hospital for relief; this being, as I have shown, one of the City sick asylums, and no private charity. It has been calculated, and I believe correctly, that the average distance an out-patient has now to walk to the hospital is at least a mile. Add to this the time he has to wait before seeing the surgeon or physician, as well as to obtain his medicine, and the time taken in walking home, and it will be admitted that the whole must be a severe tax on the weakened energies of a sick person.

Without analysing with any minuteness the expenditure, including the value of the ground on which St. Bartholomew's Hospital stands, it must be clear to all that great as are the benefits which the poor derive from it in the present day, those benefits might be still further increased by a more judicious application and distribution of its funds.

There is another hospital—Guy's—which,

although it has no right to be considered in the light of a strictly municipal institution, is still one of those endowments in whose case it is doubtful whether the inhabitants of London, in their position as ratepayers, as well as those who are sick and wounded, have not a right to take an interest, and to animadvert on its management. An account of its funds and ministrations, notwithstanding many applications, I have been unable to obtain. In fact, I may say that it is the only hospital in London where any information I might have desired was withheld from me. But those who are acquainted with its management and income state that the expenditure is far greater than would be necessary to obtain the amount of good at present derived from the institution, great as that may be. Judging of the value of the ground on which it stands, from the price obtained by St. Thomas's Hospital, and computing its interest at 5 per cent., a sum sufficiently large could be raised by its sale to cover

the whole expenditure of the Westminster Hospital—rent, maintenance of patients, and establishment charges, all together. Nay, more, it is even doubtful whether the salaries of the officials, and other contingencies, quite apart from the direct care of the poor, would not be equal to the maintenance of another hospital of the same size. Several other of the general hospitals have also endowments, but when compared with those I have already named, the amount of their revenues is comparatively insignificant, though even among these some strange contrasts might be drawn as to the expenditure and the amount of good derived.

Let me now contrast with this what *may* be done with a given amount of money, and what occasionally *is* done with it, in the different asylums and establishments in the Metropolis. I think, after I have done this, the reader will admit that a vast amount more good might often be obtained from the money expended than is at present

the case. I will begin with the general hospitals. My first contrast shall be between the expenditure of two London hospitals of standing and celebrity—the Westminster and St. Thomas's. The Westminster Hospital is an institution second to none in the Metropolis, either for the skill and honourable reputation of the medical professors attached to it, or the kindness, humanity, and care shown to the patients. Its reputation, moreover, is further established by the variety of operations and the number of cures performed in it. It contains on an average 200 beds. The cost of the establishment, including the maintenance of patients, drugs, surgical instruments, salaries for officials and servants, and establishment charges of all descriptions, including rates and taxes, amounts to £8,540 a year. To this should be added the cost of house-rent. True, the building is freehold, belonging to the charity, its value being about £30,000, which, calculated at 5 per cent., would add £1,500 more

to the expenditure, making a total of £10,040.

Let us now turn to St. Thomas's Hospital, and draw our calculation from it as it stood when purchased by the Charing Cross Railway Company. Its endowed income, as shown by the parliamentary returns, was no less than £42,800. At the time of the purchase, St. Thomas's Hospital contained 400 beds. Assuming, then, that all that can be desired for the benefit of the patients in a hospital may be found in the Westminster, it is clear that, by a comparative rate of expenditure, a greater amount of benefit to the poor and the ratepayer might be obtained from St. Thomas's than is at present the case. To what use, then, might the surplus be put?

The reader is aware (or at least ought to be, as he pays for it) that under the new Poor-law system many of the parish metropolitan district workhouses have most efficient infirmaries or rather hospitals attached, with a regular medical and nursing staff, and every

possible appliance that science can suggest. Now, if the expenditure of St. Thomas's Hospital were reduced to the level of the Westminster, the surplus, it is estimated, would be more than sufficient to maintain the whole of the new workhouse infirmaries and dispensaries without any aid from the ratepayers. If to the surplus expenditure of St. Thomas's Hospital, when compared with that of the Westminster, were added the surplus of St. Bartholomew's, Guy's, and the London Hospitals, when reduced to the same level, it is more than probable that the amount thus saved would be sufficient to maintain all the metropolitan insane, idiot, small-pox, and fever hospitals without any assistance from the poor's-rate. As to the cost of building these asylums, it has been calculated that if St. Thomas's Hospital had been erected at £100 per bed, which is 20 per cent. higher than the average cost of the hospitals for the Grenadier, Coldstream, and Fusilier Guards, and £50 more allowed per bed for the

value of the ground on which St. Thomas's is built, it would have left a surplus sufficient for the erection of pauper asylums containing 2,333 beds—and this without diverting it, but in the most trifling degree, if at all, from the original intention of its endowment.

The management and expenditure of several of our special hospitals are also subjects well worthy of the attention of my brother ratepayers. Of these, the only one (but the most important) I shall allude to is Bethlem, which, if justice were done to the ratepayer, ought to be included in the Poor-law establishments of the Metropolis. According to the "Memoranda, References, and Documents relating to the Royal Hospitals of the City of London, printed under the Direction of the Committee of the Court of Common Council,"* it appears that "Bethlem Hospital, or Hospital of St. Mary of Bethlem, was founded in the year 1247 by Simon Fitz-

* Benjamin Pardon, Paternoster Row. 1863.

mary, sheriff, near the Church of St. Botolph-without-Bishopsgate. He founded it to have been a priory of canons, with brethren and sisters; and Edward III., in the fourteenth year of his reign, granted a protection for the brethren, '*Militiæ Beatæ Mariæ de Bethlem*,' within the City of London. It was an hospital for distracted people."

About the year 1809, this hospital, which had been removed into St. George's Field, Southwark, was taken from the sole control of the Corporation of London, and, as in the case of St. Thomas's Hospital, other managers were added, whose influence being greater, the City authorities by degrees lost no inconsiderable portion of their power. Whether the change of administration was beneficial either to the insane, the ratepayers, or the public at large, is much to be doubted. By the change the purely charitable intention of the original endowment was in great part lost, and from being the pauper lunatic asylum

of the Metropolis, it is now a retreat for the lower middle class insane patients.*

And here a very singular contrast may be drawn between a really economically and well-managed Poor-law asylum, such as Caterham, and that of Bethlem—a wealthy ancient endowment under the control of almost irresponsible trustees, certainly as far as the Poor-law Board or municipal authorities is concerned. Bethlem Hospital, as the reader is doubtless aware, is situated in Lambeth. Although the building is of vast size, it is in many respects hardly adapted for an insane asylum—and certainly, for the amount expended on it, a much more efficient one might be erected. It receives

* As perfect a specimen as could well be produced of the total disregard paid by the Court of Chancery to the original intention of many of our charitable endowments may be observed in Bethlem Hospital. Formerly, only those whose friends were too poor to contribute to its funds were admitted gratuitously; all others were obliged to pay a moderate weekly sum. At present, *all those too poor to contribute anything are rigorously excluded*, while those to a greater or less extent able to pay for the benefits they receive, *are admitted gratuitously!*

220 patients, who are treated with great kindness and consideration. In fact, it would perhaps be impossible to mention a lunatic asylum in England where greater skill, sympathy, and care are shown to the patients; but at what cost we shall presently see. The imbecile asylum at Caterham is situated in a good position on the Surrey hills (in that respect in a far more healthy locality than Bethlem), and is an institution built by the Poor-law authorities from moneys raised from the general rate on the Metropolis.

Although there is proverbially no agreeing on points of taste, the architectural elevation in the Caterham Asylum is certainly equal, and in the opinion of many is vastly superior, to that of Bethlem, while the ground it covers is as certainly six times as large. I will not stop to give any minute description of the Caterham building itself, but, as the reader may imagine, it is of immense size. The façade, though destitute of that meretricious ornament which

architects of the present day are inclined to heap on buildings intended for charitable uses, is in good taste, and by no means unpicturesque. The blocks of buildings in the rear dedicated to the use of the patients are unpretending so far as the architecture is concerned; but are well constructed, three storeys in height, and with numerous lofty windows on each side, so as to ensure perfect ventilation. The internal arrangements of the asylum are admirable in every respect. The food is of excellent quality, and the cooking perfect. At the time of my unexpected visit I was fortunate enough to see the dinner being served up. There were roast and boiled joints, minced meat for the aged and epileptic, several kinds of fish, custard and other puddings, and excellent *ragouts* of Australian mutton, stewed, with fresh vegetables of different descriptions. All were cooked in a manner that would not have disgraced the *chefs* of the Carlton or Reform Clubs.

The cleanliness of the establishment was beyond all praise; and without attempting to draw any invidious comparison between it and Bethlem on that score, I can unhesitatingly state that it was quite on an equal footing with Bethlem. On the subject of the cleanliness maintained among the patients, the reader may form some idea from the following fact. Noticing a heap of linen in the centre of the laundry, in size somewhat resembling an overturned load of hay, I inquired whether that was the accumulated linen of the last week.

"Last week, sir!" said one of the laundry-maids; "why, that is yesterday's washing alone. We wash every day the used linen of the day before."

"How many articles do you, on an average, wash daily?" I inquired.

"Our daily average, sir, is about two thousand pieces."

One of the most admirable features in this asylum is that of utilising to the

greatest extent the labour of the inmates. Not only are their services used in the kitchen, laundry, and garden; but the reader would hardly believe what perfection several branches of skilled labour has been reached by these poor creatures, the majority of whom, prior to their entering the asylum, had never done a day's useful work in their lives.

To take one example among many. On the occasion of my visit, Dr. Adams, the physician of the asylum, conducted me into the female workroom, where the dresses of the patients were cut out, and delivered to the different wards to be made up. It was a long lofty room, in which were many large tables covered with linen and woollen cloth. I forget how many imbeciles were employed there at the time, but they were very numerous; and, although superintended by two or three professional dressmakers, the dresses were not only made by themselves, but cut out as well. The reader

may be curious to know the quantity and quality of work done in this idiot co-operative dressmaking establishment. The following items, which I received from the superintendent of the work department, may give some idea of the magnitude of the operations carried on in it. During the year 1871, the patients had made 1,729 petticoats, 1,816 aprons, 4,537 caps, and 1,729 dresses, besides the whole of the linen used in the establishment, such as sheets, tablecloths, chemises, &c., in all amounting to 18,115 articles.

On the male side the same order and regularity exists as on the female. In the workshops I noticed several persons employed on labour which at first sight it seemed hardly possible the idiot's mind could be brought to understand, or his hands to perform. Shoemaking and tailoring occupied a great number. Noticing in the workshops of the shoemakers some very dangerous-looking knives, I inquired whether it was not

imprudent to leave such weapons in the hands of those who might use them offensively. I was told, however, that no accident or mischief had ever occurred among them, and that knives and awls had never been used in any of the few disputes which had arisen in the establishment. Besides those who work in the shoemakers' and tailors' shops, I found that no fewer than 79 were employed in the cleansing and general economy of the wards, 17 in the upholsterers' shop, 121 in the grounds, besides several others in the gas-house, the engine-house, the engineer's office, and the mess-room, — amounting altogether to 300 male patients. These, added to 452 of the female idiots and lunatics, make a grand total of 752 patients employed in what may be termed skilled and profitable labour. The remaining portion of the inmates are either too old, too infirm, or too young to be made useful, though the labour of many of these is occasionally utilised to the fullest

degree consistent with their well-being and health.

I afterwards visited the garden and grounds and the engine-house. In the former, I noticed specimens of gardening that might not have disgraced the market-garden grounds at Fulham. Yet by far the largest portion of the labour had been performed by poor creatures who, till they entered the asylum, were probably ignorant of the way to handle a spade. I was also shown a piece of ground of about three acres, which was laid out for a cricket-field, the draining and all other work having been done by the idiots. Nor is this system of co-operation merely a benefit to the health and comfort of the patients themselves; so admirably managed is the asylum, under the Poor-law authorities of the Metropolis, and, *mirabile dictu*, so economically, as to be—and shortly will be more so—of great advantage to the metropolitan ratepayer. Here certainly the ratepayer has but little cause to complain,

for by the system of co-operation adopted in the institution, notwithstanding the good food, good cooking, and excellent clothes bestowed on the inmates, the cost of each adult, including house-rent, establishment charges, food, and clothing, does not at the present time exceed 1*s.* 1*d.* a day—being in point of fact considerably less than the cost of a pauper child in the Union schools of Annerly or Hanwell.

But this is not all. 'Other funds might possibly be applicable to the reduction of the rates for the sick poor to a still greater extent, if only a sufficiently energetic public agitation were started on the subject. I have stated shortly the condition of Bethlem Hospital, and at greater length that of the Caterham Asylum. According to the published report of the latter institution, it would appear that 1,800 patients are maintained in it at a cost of about £44,000. Bethlem Hospital contained, at the time of the report, 266 patients. Its gross income was admitted to

be £23,854 19*s.* 1*d.* In the expenditure of Caterham, the interest and cost of building, besides the purchase of ground, is taken into the calculation. This, from the somewhat obscure manner in which the balance-sheet is made out, hardly appears to be the case in the expenditure of Bethlem. Should the interest on the value of the building not be comprised, it would raise its income some thousands a year more—very nearly to three-fourths of the expenditure at Caterham. One point should especially be noticed. According to "the report," the cost of the staff at Bethlem Hospital, including the superior officials, servants, and nurses, is no less than £5,100 8*s.* a year; that of Caterham, for 1,800 patients, is £6,361. It may possibly be thought that the patients in Bethlem Hospital are of a description more difficult to manage than those at Caterham; but, granting this, I still maintain that greater economy might be practised in Bethlem Hospital, and with much advantage to the

public. Admitting, as I do, that patients suffering from acute mania require a greater amount of attention than imbeciles, yet the amount expended in Bethlem seems excessive. As a proof, I may mention that the cost of the Criminal Lunatic Asylum at Fisherton—one of the largest establishments in the kingdom—did not average more than 11*s.* per head a week, including establishment charges of every description.

But another subject remains to be mentioned. Although Bethlem Hospital was, in the fullest sense of the word, intended purely as a charity, the patients, as I before stated, are none of them belonging to poor families. I am ready to admit that an insane adult is, in the family of a person of moderate income, a great tie and expense, and that an asylum ought to be provided for their reception; yet, at the same time, in a charitable institution like Bethlem, it would be no great hardship if the friends of each patient were obliged to subscribe some trifle per week for

their maintenance; for, as I have shown in the case of the Caterham Asylum, a patient may be well and satisfactorily attended to for a sum not exceeding 8*s*. a week. I will not touch on the subject of St. Luke's Hospital, as it would occupy too much space, although the same glaring anomalies are not to be found in it as at Bethlem; but I will conclude my chapter on the sick poor, hoping that I have to a considerable extent proved to the reader how much *loss of power* is at present experienced by defective management in our large medical asylums. If I have not shown that the whole sick poor of the Metropolis might be maintained without calling for pecuniary aid from the ratepayer, I have at least proved that, with judicious management, the rates for the sick poor might be greatly reduced. And it is certainly true that the public should bestir themselves in the question, for it is more than probable that in a short time they will be called upon for the sum of £150,000

to build another asylum for the imbecile poor.

And here arises a question interesting both to the moralist and the ratepayer. Formerly the pauper imbeciles of the Metropolis were lodged in the workhouses; but their number increased so rapidly that it was judged better that an asylum should be built for their reception, and the splendid establishment for 1,600 patients at Leavesden was erected to receive them. But Leavesden had hardly been finished and filled with patients before it was found that double the amount of accommodation was required for the pauper imbeciles in the Metropolis. Whether it were that this was an error in the calculation, or that idiocy has increased with frightful rapidity—(perhaps the latter is the more correct of the two)—it is difficult to say. The erection of a similar building at Caterham was then decided on, and soon completed. On the occasion of my visit to that asylum, I inquired of Dr. Adams whether he did not

consider the immense buildings at Caterham, besides the one at Leavesden, were not in excess of the needs of the Metropolis, especially when so many other asylums, public and private, were in existence. He replied that this was not the case; that vast as were the asylums of Hanwell, Colney Hatch, Caterham, Leavesden, Bethlem, St. Luke's, and others for the reception of the imbecile and insane, they were too small for the number of applicants waiting for admission. Should idiocy and insanity increase in proportion as they had been doing for some years past, the new building would hardly be finished before the attention of the magistrates would be called to provide further house accommodation for the idiots and insane of the Metropolis. And to what is this fearful increase of idiocy to be attributed? Alas! there is too much reason to believe that the cause is easily to be found; but Government makes but small exertions to stop it. It may be shown—where their his-

tory can be traced—that the greater portion of pauper idiots are the children of drunken parents, especially drunken mothers. Should the vice increase as it has been doing of late years, not only must there be a still heavier tax levied on the ratepayer, but a still more serious cause for regret to the philanthropist and the moralist.

CHAPTER VII.

PAUPER SCHOOLS.

THE next subject of interest to the metropolitan public in general, and to the ratepayer in particular, that I shall bring under the notice of the reader, is the maintenance and education of poor children; and in this class I include also those under the management of the Poor-law authorities. I will commence with the latter. Prior, however, to analysing the expenditure of the different district schools, and the cost of the children therein, I will mention some schools maintained by charitable contributions, and their cost, so as to be able not only to contrast with them the cost of the district schools paid for by the ratepayer, but to

show also the admirable manner in which many of these (unendowed) charities are conducted. By doing so I shall be able to prove how exorbitant is the amount the ratepayer is called upon to contribute for the maintenance of these schools, when the amount of good derived from them is no greater than those supported by private contributions, if as great.

Among the most economically and efficiently managed charity schools in the kingdom, are the Glasgow Industrial Schools. On the 3rd of March, 1847, the first public meeting was held in connection with the organization of industrial schools in Glasgow; and on the 27th of July in the same year the first school was opened, in the premises which had shortly before been erected in North Frederick Street by the directors of the Night Asylum. These premises were soon found to be insufficient for the purpose, and shortly afterwards other buildings were erected on a spot in a suburb known as Rotten Row, to which the whole establishment was removed.

At this period the children were only fed and educated at the school. In the evening they went to their homes;—those who were orphans or otherwise deprived of homes being boarded with respectable persons, widows and others.

From a very small beginning the number of children in the school in 1866 had increased to 266, and in 1869 there were no fewer than 615. The present buildings are of handsome elevation, plainly but commodiously fitted up in the interior, with excellent schoolrooms and all necessary appliances. Besides the usual primary education and routine—certainly fully equal, if not superior, to that of any of the district schools in the Metropolis—the children are all taught some handicraft, so as to enable them the moment they leave the school to engage in some occupation whereby they can earn an honest livelihood. Those boys who have a turn for the sea are transferred to the new Clyde training-ship *Cumberland*, and in point of fact formed the nucleus of that establish-

ment. Of the trades taught in the schools may be mentioned tailoring, shoemaking, paper-bag making, and farm-gardening to the boys; needlework, machine-sewing, and laundry-work to the girls; the directors being thoroughly alive to the importance of the children being trained to habits of industry, as well as being taught to read, write, and cipher.

Another excellent plan adopted in these schools is to have occasional meetings of those girls who have been brought up in them, so that the directors may ascertain not only that their lives are respectable, but be able to assist them in procuring employment should they be out of work. An interesting meeting of this kind was lately held in the Rotten Row schools. There were present about fifty girls who had been inmates of the institution, and are now doing well or comfortably settled in life. Many men who were educated in these schools are now occupying respectable positions, and the women are,

many of them, the wives of industrious and thriving men.

And now for the income and expenditure. The gross amount of income for the year 1869 was £8,904 10*s.* 6½*d.*, including house-rent, which is estimated at £600 a year. The whole expenditure was £8,300 10*s.* 6½*d.*, which gives an average cost for each child of £13 7*s.* for food, clothing, education, and establishment charges; and these, it should be understood, all equally as good as those of the London district schools. But I may be told that there are two elements in the Glasgow Industrial Schools which I have not taken into consideration: first, the smaller cost of provisions in Scotland; and next, that the boys being taught some trade to a great extent assist, by the produce of their labours, the cost of their maintenance. True, this, with the wages of those boys in situations but living in the house, would reduce the expenditure some £550 a year, and, moreover, the co-operative element developed in these

schools of employing the boys in the work of the establishment—such as baking, shoe-mending, &c.—if taken into consideration, would reduce the amount still more. But even admitting these items, a great portion of the smallness of the cost is to be attributed to the admirably economical management, which is to be observed in every department of the institution. We will now contrast the expenditure of some well-managed schools nearer home, where liberality is combined with discretion and economy. The three I will select to contrast with the district schools are, the Orphanage maintained by the Anglican Sisterhood at Clewer—an establishment based on extreme High Church principles; the next, among the broadest and possibly most Catholic (in the strict etymology of the word) of Dissenting religious denominations, Mr. Spurgeon's Orphanage for Fatherless Boys at Stockwell; and the third, the Home for Destitute Boys.*

* Mr. William Williams, honorary secretary, Long Acre.

In the Anglican Sisterhood the Orphanage is solely for girls. Being resolved to attempt the description only from the results of my own inspection, I addressed a note to the Lady Superior for permission to visit the Orphange, which was not only accorded me in the most courteous manner, but the reply contained an invitation to visit the whole of the charitable establishments at Clewer. It would be difficult to find a charity more admirably conducted than the Orphanage. The children were all healthy-looking, cleanly, and well dressed; their education, both secular and religious, excellent. They were well fed and well cared for, and these two elements were more strongly impressed on me by the contented, happy appearance of the girls, than even by the respect with which they spoke of the treatment they received. On conversing with the Lady Superior I inquired what was the expense of each girl in the Orphanage. She told me it would average about £19 a year for food,

clothing, instruction, house-rent, and all other charges. And here it should also be borne in mind that the house-rent at Clewer, from the elaborate and ornamental nature of the buildings, would be certainly higher than what would be necessary in a pauper district school. Moreover, the value of the labour of the girls in the Orphanage was not sufficient, as in the case of the Glasgow schools, to afford any relief to the funds of the establishment.

Of the rise and origin of the Stockwell Orphanage I may dwell somewhat more at length, as proving the amount of charitable feeling existing among the English public, even when they do not number among them any of the wealthier or nobler classes. The idea of the Orphanage seems to have originated with a note which Mr. Spurgeon addressed to his congregation. The first application he made to them was for a comparatively trifling amount. "You many of you," he said, "helped me to build the Taber-

nacle ; and I pray you, if you have derived benefit from hearing my sermons since then, to give another proof of your affection, and help the poor fatherless children whom I love for Jesus' sake. The sum of £600 will build a house, smaller sums will help to pay for the land, help to support the children, or to increase the endowment fund. There is need for all that can be given. I ask nothing for myself, but much for my Lord. Shall I ask in vain ?"

In reply to his demand for this small sum, Mr. Spurgeon received so much support from his congregation, and others, that in a short time money flowed in at a rate he could hardly have expected when he commenced his good work. Perhaps the better way of conveying to the reader the result of his application — which, if we may judge the tree by its fruits, certainly had on it the blessing of Heaven—will be to make a few extracts from Mr. Spurgeon's speech on laying the foundation stone of

the Orphanage, on the 9th of September, 1867 :—

"I think it was in the month of August last year that I wrote an article in the *Sword and Trowel*, suggesting many modes of usefulness which might be adopted by the Christian public. That article was read by a sister in Christ, who had for some years determined to devote her substance to the work of maintaining poor fatherless children. She thought she had found out the proper individual to whom to entrust her money, and I received a note from her, which, when I read and read again, greatly startled me. The note said :— 'I am determined to devote £20,000 to the work of maintaining orphans; would you be good enough to come and see me about it?' Now, I thought at first that perhaps the lady had put a 'nought' or two too many, and again, that it was just possible some one desired to play me a trick. However, I found it to be my duty to see about it, and I went to this good sister, and found her to be a

really practical and earnest woman, desirous of having her money expended upon fatherless children, with a special view to their souls being cared for, and to their being trained in the fear of God and the doctrines of truth. I objected, however, for some time to undertake the work, having too much to do already. However, our good sister said I had many friends who would help me. We talked the matter over together, and my dear friends the deacons agreed to become trustees with me, and assist me with their usual vigour. Hence it is that we are here to-day, upon a piece of ground which has been purchased for the erection of houses for taking care of fatherless boys. The first three stones of these houses will be laid this afternoon. The first stone should be laid by our sister Mrs. Hillyard, who has given the £20,000; but unfortunately the workpeople have laid the tackle to the wrong house, and I am obliged to begin. The next is the house of which she is to lay the foundation stone. The money for that house

is given by a merchant of the city of London, a gentleman well known to many, but not to be mentioned now or at any other time. He gives it unto God, and does not desire to have his name mentioned. That house is to be called the 'Merchant's House.' The house of which I shall lay the first stone is to be called the 'Silver Wedding House,' and is given by a sister who has lived happily with her beloved husband for twenty-five years. About a month before the wedding day came round, her husband said to her, 'My dear, I mean to make you a present on your wedding day of £500.' 'Well,' said she, 'I have often wished for as large a sum as that to give to Mr. Spurgeon for some of his good works.' So away she came with her £500, and I now have to lay the foundation stone for her. Then the next house, the stone of which will be laid by Mr. Higgs, is to be called the 'Workman's House.' The workmen in connection with our esteemed brother, Mr. Higgs, of the Crown Works, agreed, at a little meet-

ing we held there, to build the house, Mr. Higgs agreeing to give the materials. But Mr. Higgs, thinking it would be a long time before they worked their money out, has at once given the whole of it in the shape of that great shed yonder, which will be a splendid permanent building for the children to play in, and a place to hold such gatherings as that we shall hold to-night, when we require to have them. Our working friends who are present should be reminded of a very solemn fact. A promise was made at our meeting at Mr. Higgs's that we would endeavour, whenever there were any vacancies in the house, to take in their orphans if unfortunately any of them should be taken away, and the men who had contributed should have the first place for their children. Now, mark this. Last Wednesday there worked at yonder counter one of Mr. Higgs's workmen, who has now gone to another world, leaving two boys behind him. He was one of those who had contributed to this house, and I have

no doubt that his little ones will share in the benefits of this institution as soon as it is possible for them to do so. Let me say, that though only these three houses are to be begun to-day, yet we have money in hand for more. I only hope you will bring in money enough to-day to pay for the land, which has cost £3,000, and then we can go on. There is one family connected with this church whose memory is very dear to us—I mean the Olney family. They have this afternoon given me a cheque for £500 for building a house in memory of their sainted mother. The house will be called 'Unity House' in memory of her."

As stated above, the foundation stone of the Orphanage was laid on the 9th September, 1867. Let us now see from the report of 1869 the progress that had been made during the interim of two years. The amount required for the land, £3,000, has been paid off, and the whole of the houses were erected without one penny of the original sum of

£20,000, which had been given for the purpose, having been expended. That gift is still locked up in railway debentures and other securities, destined to remain as a permanent endowment, and efforts were being made from time to time to increase the original sum. The "Silver Wedding House," the "Merchant's House," and the "Workman's House," had not only been completed, but Mr. Thomas Olney had presented a fourth, also erected. The sum of £1,400, raised by Baptist Churches as a testimonial to Mr. Spurgeon, secured the erection of the next two houses. The seventh was raised by the contributions of the students at the Pastor's College, and the eighth by the Sunday Schools of the country; these two being known respectively as the "Student's" and the "Sunday School Houses." In addition to these there are a large dining-hall and kitchen, a commodious school-room, and a covered playground. The whole of these buildings were raised at an average cost of

£10,200, and are entirely free from debt. Each house is destined to receive thirty boys, and is under the care of a Godly matron. "In this way," the report continues, "the loss of the parental home is somewhat compensated for, and the best influences are brought to bear upon the children in the formation of Christian character. The children take their meals together in the dining-hall, and are taught a sound English education under the British school system. To obviate the evils of the canvassing system, and to secure the admission of the most needy and deserving cases, each application is decided upon its own merits. Orphan and fatherless children, between the ages of six and ten, are eligible for admission, irrespective of creed or locality. Already nearly one thousand applications have been received, and these have all been examined with the utmost care. One hundred and fifty boys are at present (1869) in the Orphanage."

Since the above date, in order to prevent

epidemics from running through the whole of the juvenile community, an excellent infirmary has been erected apart from the buildings. This is already paid for, as well as a laundry and a large bath. By the balance-sheet it appears that the whole cost of the maintenance of these one hundred and fifty boys, including salaries, wages, provisions, books, and other expenses, did not exceed £2,177, an average of £14 10*s.* a head. But it should be understood that the amount mentioned in the balance-sheet is considerably supplemented by contributions in kind from different individuals interested in the work. Some of these contributions I have much pleasure in quoting, and the more so (*not* being a member of the Baptist denomination myself), as showing how easily charitable feeling may be developed by an energetic and talented minister of religion, and how much good may be obtained from the contributions, if judiciously applied.

Prior to the building of the Orphanage, two

ladies, the Misses Dransfield, of Surbiton House, Champion Hill, brought the Orphanage under the notice of their pupils, and impressed on them the necessity of doing something in aid of so valuable an institution. Their appeal was readily responded to, a quantity of calico and flannel was purchased, and some shirts cut out of different sizes, suitable to boys from six to fifteen years of age. These young ladies have already furnished for the institution no fewer than one thousand five hundred shirts.

Mr. Phillips, of the Tabernacle, supplies one meal of soup per week; and Mr. and Mrs. Tyson give annually one ton of soap. There are many other contributions of this kind, too numerous to mention.

Another instance of the good feeling entertained by members of the Baptist creed for Mr. Spurgeon's Orphanage may also be quoted. Economy, without parsimony, as I stated before, being one of the objects of the institution, they purchase all their pro-

visions at first hand. One of the purveyors of the Orphanage is, or was, a farmer residing in the neighbourhood of Wimbledon. On the occasion of a visit of the superintendent of the schools (Mr. Charlesworth) to purchase provisions, he remarked upon the healthy situation of the farm, and how much he should like, if possible, to give the boys a day's run about it. "Would you?" said the farmer. "Then, as far as I am concerned, nothing is more easy. I shall not only be happy to see them all; but, further, if they come I will provide tea for the whole number." Mr. Charlesworth, pleased with the offer, promised that if he could make suitable arrangements, he would certainly accept it on the part of the pupils. But still much more had to be done. The tea was all very well, but a party of 200 to 250 hungry boys (for their number has lately increased) required during the day something more than that. However, as far as food went, he soon found a way

out of the difficulty. He wrote to a member of the Baptist persuasion, a large pork-pie manufacturer at Melton Mowbray, I think, telling him of the offer of a day's holiday for the boys, and asked if he could somewhat assist in finding provisions for them. A reply was immediately received, asking how many boys there were in the schools; and the number returned was 250 A few days afterwards some packages were received at the Orphanage, containing 250 pork-pies—one for each boy, and of a size sufficient for a liberal day's consumption.

Still something was wanting. Happy as the boys would be at Wimbledon, the locality was at a considerable distance from Stockwell, and should the boys be obliged to walk both ways, it would fatigue them greatly, as well as detract from their day's pleasure. In this dilemma, the superintendent applied to a van proprietor in Brixton Road, a member of the Baptist congregation, asking if he could assist in the

matter. Without the slightest hesitation the van proprietor promised to find, gratuitously, vans to carry the whole of the children. The day came, and a happy time the poor boys had of it. In the afternoon they were taken through the camp, then on the common, and their reception among the volunteers, as soon as they heard that the boys had come from Mr. Spurgeon's Orphanage, was of the most hospitable description—possibly a trifle too much so. Whether any cases of indigestion followed upon the visit to the camp, deponent sayeth not.

The third example I shall quote is that of the Industrial Schools for Destitute Boys, part of whom are in the *Chichester* training ship and other institutions. I would willingly go into as long a description of these schools as I have done of the Stockwell Orphanage, as they are equally worthy of commendation, but space will not allow me. Suffice it say, that in this institution a boy can be well fed, educated, and clothed, all

expenses included, for the sum of £15 a year.

Let the reader now contrast the expenditure of these schools with those of the London district schools, under the control of the Poor-law Board. Each child in Annerly costs the ratepayer, including board, lodging, instruction, establishment expenses, and house-rent, no less a sum than £23 a year; at Plashet £25,* and at Hanwell £29—the average of the three schools being not less than £25. And yet no further advantage is gained in these schools than in the three institutions with which I have contrasted them. Has the reader ever visited one of these district schools? If not, let him do so; and it is more than probable that he will not only considerably modify the opinion he may have formed respecting the parsimony and cruelty of the Poor-law guardians, but even go so far as to believe that more is expended than need be for the amount of good ob-

* See Parliamentary Report.

tained. Let him, for example, visit the Hanwell schools. On arriving, he may possibly consider he has made a mistake, and from its elevation imagine that he has arrived at a palace instead of a pauper school. He will there find that every care that ingenuity and kindness can suggest is lavished on the children. Should he be a first-class mechanic, a small tradesman, professional man of limited income, or a clerk in a lawyer's or merchant's office with a salary of £150 a year, he will conclude that more (perhaps double the amount) is spent upon each of these children than he is able to spend on each of his own family.

I remember some time since being present at a parochial meeting in the neighbourhood of Holborn to receive the report of the smaller ratepayers who had been deputed to visit the Hanwell Schools. One among them addressed the meeting in the following manner:—

"You asked me if I was pleased with the

schools. Not only was I much pleased with them, but I envied for my own children the comforts I saw in them. I am, however, only a small shopkeeper. I should like to have cold baths prepared for my children every morning; but I can't afford it. I should like them to live in a house surrounded by park-like fields, with dry play-grounds in wet weather; but I can't afford it. I should like to have my children always under the eye of an experienced medical man; but I can't afford it. I should like my children to be taught music; but I can't afford it. I should consider it a blessing were I able to obtain for my four children, put together, half the amount of dwelling-room allotted for one child in the pauper asylum at Hanwell; but I can't afford it. I was informed by the doctor, a most kind-hearted and clever man, that the bedroom space alone allotted to each child is not less than 540 cubic feet—that is to say, when in good health. If a child is attacked with illness, he is immediately re-

moved to a separate building, in which the space allotted to him is nearly double the amount for those in health; while, should the disease be of a contagious or epidemic character, the healthy children need dread no contagion from their sick schoolfellow. In my own house, if one of my four children is ill, he is obliged to remain in the same room with the three others, and the space I can afford to the four is less than that allowed to one sick child in the pauper infirmary. And yet I am obliged to pay for rates and parochial taxes no less than £20 a year, a considerable portion of which goes to the maintenance of those pauper children, who are so far better provided with every comfort and convenience than my own. The Government and wealthy say, 'Pity the poor pauper.' That is all true enough; but, at the same time, I say, 'Pity the poor ratepayer as well.'"

And now let me touch for one moment on the boarding-out system, which at present is being entertained by many philanthropic

persons, especially those connected with the "Howard Association," and that with so much powerful argument as to render the question well worthy the notice of the metropolitan ratepayer. But first let me give a proof, in support of the theory how far judicious charity, well and economically applied, may not only be administered with good moral and physical effect, but at a far less cost than expensively-managed rate-supporting district schools.

The wife of a hard-working, sober bricklayer's labourer, in the parish of Kensington, died, leaving a family of eight young children in a state of great poverty. The case having come under the notice of two young ladies, they first collected sufficient money to relieve the pressing distress of the family, and then determined to support, at their own cost, two of the younger children, one eight and the other six years of age. That the children should be brought up in good air, and well cared for, they requested their

married sister, who resided in one of the southern counties, to find some respectable farm-labourer's wife to take charge of them, and that she (the sister) would herself undertake to superintend them. A suitable person was easily found, who readily accepted the offer of 7*s.* a week for the maintenance and care of the two children. Clothing was provided for them by the young ladies from their own cast-off dresses, and all the arrangements appear to have been carried out in a most satisfactory manner. The children are well fed and well cared for by the woman who has charge of them, under the superintendence of the young ladies' married sister. Now take the 7*s.* a week, and estimate the value of clothing at 1*s.* more, and the two children cost in the aggregate £20 16*s.* a year. Suppose, instead, they had been thrown on the parish, and sent to the Annerly schools; there, as before stated, the two would have been supported by the ratepayer at a cost of £46

a year, or, in other words, £25 4*s.* per annum more than they cost the ladies who so kindly had taken charge of them. And here another noteworthy feature presents itself. The poor father shuddered at the idea of his children being sent to the Annerly pauper schools, where so large an amount would be spent on them, and yet accepted with gratitude the charitable and at the same time more economical offer of the ladies.

In the reports published by the "Howard Association," some very extraordinary facts are quoted, showing the great economy and advantage, both to the child and the rate-payer, of the boarding-out system.

The cost of each child in the Swinton district schools, at Manchester, is 6*s.* 4*d.* a week (£16 9*s.* per annum); and in the Leeds pauper schools 7*s.* 7*d.*, or, with the interest on the building, 9*s.* 2*d.* (£23 16*s.* per annum). But throughout Scotland and Ireland, and in about twenty-five English unions, boarding-

out (which is altogether different from "farming-out" in numbers) has been practised with striking success and economy. The average cost in Edinburgh is 3*s.* 6*d.* weekly, and in England 4*s.* 6*d.* (£11 14*s.* a year). The girls are thus trained amid family affection, and with a knowledge of domestic duties. Their health is also found to be better secured, in addition to the exemption from ophthalmia and skin diseases which infest many of these pauper schools, where many hundreds of children are massed together. Another authority says that the Swinton Schools had cost something like £70,000, and, he believed, had done but little practical good. A Dr. Craven, at a meeting held on the subject of boarding-out pauper children, mentioned a rate-supported school where the children cost £57 a year each, and people getting only 12*s.* or 14*s.* a week had to contribute to their support. Many other examples of the kind might be quoted, but I submit that those I have mentioned are

sufficient to impress on the metropolitan ratepayer how worthy a subject for his consideration is that of the boarding-out of pauper children. But whatever may be the reader's opinion on that point, I think I have added another proof of the clumsy, heavy, and expensive machinery of the metropolitan Poor-law system, and the tremendous loss in the working of it.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHARITY SCHOOLS.

SHOULD Dr. Farr be right in his opinion of the Poor Law, that it should be considered as the equitable almsgiving of the community — and I agree with him — the charity school possesses a closer affinity to the district pauper school than would at first sight appear. I may be told, and with very great justice, that the pauper school carries with it an ignominy from which the charity school is exempt. When Dickens, in his "Oliver Twist," spoke of the contempt with which Bolter, the charity boy, looked down upon poor Oliver, the workhouse child, his remark had more truth in it than would at first appear. Should the reader doubt it, ask any Blue-coat boy from Christ's Hospital

whether he considers himself in no higher position in society than a pauper child; and it is more than likely that he will be indignant at the bare possibility of a comparison being drawn between them. And yet no district school in the Metropolis is founded upon a more thoroughly pauper element, as I shall presently show, than is the Blue-coat School. I would not for one moment let it be understood that I in any manner whatever wish to abolish the honest aversion which exists among the poor at the possibility of their children being sent to a pauper school; but, at the same time, one of the objects of the present chapter is to submit to the reader whether, were our charitable school endowments more judiciously applied, the whole of our pauper children—certainly of the orphan children—in our district schools might be maintained from the funds at present in the Metropolis for the maintenance and education of poor children. Few who have not gone deeply into the matter can fail to wonder at the enormous

waste in these institutions—a waste not only permitted, but, stranger still, having received the sanction of different Lord Chancellors. I may be told that, although this state of things formerly existed, great reformations have lately taken place, by which many of the schools are now on a different footing. All that may be true; but I maintain, and hope to prove to the reader, that a vast deal more remains to be done. I am perfectly ready to admit that instances similar to that of the "Troutbeck Legacy" could not be perpetrated in the present day, certainly not without raising a strong cry of popular indignation, submissive as the population of the Metropolis may be to injustice of that kind. As possibly the reader may not be aware of the particulars of the Troutbeck affair, I may be excused more particularly referring to it, as it will further tend to prove how fearfully the poor as well as the ratepayer have suffered and may still suffer under a strict interpretation of the law.

In the year 1815, a tradesman of the name of Troutbeck died in Wapping, in which parish he had resided more than fifty years. He appears to have been rather an eccentric character. He had neither friends nor relations, and but few acquaintances; yet he was much respected for his inoffensive manners and general integrity of conduct. Although parsimonious in the extreme in his housekeeping, and suspected by many to be a miser, he could occasionally be very charitable. At his death he was found to be the owner of a vast amount more property than any had given him credit for. He left a will, in which he bequeathed the sum of £6,000, to build a new wing to the Church charity schools of St. John's, Wapping, in which he had been educated; and the residue of his property was to be applied to the board, education, and clothing of poor boys of the same parish. At the time of his death that "Most religious and gracious king," George IV., was Prince Regent. In consequence of his

licentious extravagance, he had exceeded his income by more than a quarter of a million, and an application was made to the House of Commons for a grant of money to be appropriated to the payment of his debts. The Minister stated that he was happy to inform the House, that, although the debts of his Royal Highness amounted to that sum, the nation would not be called upon to pay the whole. A tradesman in Wapping, of the name of Troutbeck, had lately died, leaving a sum of money for the building of some schools, and a further sum, considerably exceeding £100,000, to the maintenance and education of poor boys in the parish. He was authorised by the Lord Chancellor (Eldon) to state that, inasmuch as the said Troutbeck had no relatives, the whole of his property was an escheat to the Crown. Two or three claimants afterwards started up as relatives of Troutbeck, but none could prove his identity, and the whole of the property was divided, under the excuse of paying the

Prince's debts, among black-legs, fiddlers, jewellers, opera dancers, tailors, and other creditors possibly still more objectionable. It can now, it is stated, be easily shown that the different investments of Troutbeck's money at the time of his death have since that date increased so enormously in value as to be sufficient—were the amount expended in the manner Troutbeck intended—to maintain the whole of the poor children not of Wapping only, but of the whole eastern districts of the Metropolis, without any contribution from other sources.

Although it is perfectly true that no such gross example of the perversion of money left for charitable purposes can be found in the present day, there are still many abuses among our charitable schools and endowments which may appear to a future generation scarcely less objectionable than that of the "Troutbeck Legacy." To go at any great length into the numerous charity schools of the Metropolis would far

exceed my limits. I will, therefore, bring especially under the notice of the reader two only — the Blue-coat School, or Christ's Hospital, and that known as King Edward's Schools, under the management of the governors of Bridewell Hospital.

To begin, then, with Christ's Hospital. As before stated, this charity was endowed directly and solely as the pauper school of the Metropolis. In the words of the Royal Charter, 1553, it was granted to the City of London—"In consideration of their godly endeavours and travail for the good of the said poor, and every sort of them, and that by such sort and means as neither the child in its infancy shall want virtuous education and bringing up, neither when he shall grow up to full age shall lack matter whereon the same may virtuously occupy himself in good occupation, profitable to the common weal."

Stow, in his "Summerie," 1556, speaking of Christ's Hospital, says: "It was established

to take the chylde out of the strete, which was the seede and increase of beggary, by reason of ydle bringing up. And to nouryshe the saide chylde in some goode learning, and exercise profitable to the common weal." He goes on to say, that in one month from the opening of the school, 21st of November, 1552, "children had been taken from the streets to school in numbre fower hundred."

In the management of Christ's Hospital a gross injustice appears to have been perpetrated on the female portion of the population. From "Machyn's Diary," 1563, and other contemporaneous works published shortly after the endowment of this school, the number of boys and girls in it seems to have been equal. Machyn especially mentions a certain civic procession in which the children of Christ's Hospital formed part, "walking two and two, a boy and a girl."

By reference to the Charity Commissioners' Report, it would appear that the gross income, from all sources, of Christ's Hospital amounts

to not less than £70,000 a year. But a further item should also be added to this enormous sum—house-rent. The Blue-coat School occupies nearly five acres of ground in the most valuable part of the Metropolis. It would, perhaps, be difficult to estimate its just worth, but a railway company, it is reported, lately offered no less a sum than £600,000 for the whole space. Possibly this may be considered more than its worth; but lately, in conversation with a certain architect and surveyor, than whom no man in London is better acquainted with City property, he assured me that there would be no difficulty in raising a public company willing to purchase as a speculation the whole plot of ground, to let out on building leases, for the sum of £400,000. If this estimate be correct, it would, at the rate of 5 per cent. interest, give an additional £20,000 a year to the charity.

I will not detain the reader with an account of King Edward's Schools. Suffice it to say

that they are of those which come as strictly within the denomination of charity schools as the Blue-coat School. In fact, they were the industrial schools attached originally to Christ's Hospital. Even at the present time, the education far more resembles that of an industrial school than one purely educational, and the food and clothing are certainly not superior to those in many of our district pauper schools. By the Governors' Report of 1869, it would appear that the total number of children in the schools was 217. The gross income of Bridewell Hospital, in which King Edward's schools are included, would appear to be £18,175 16*s.* 6*d.* To this, however, should be added the value of the ground on which Bridewell Hospital stands, which has been estimated at £2,000 a year more—a very large plot of ground at the back, and appertaining to the hospital, having for many years past remained idle and unproductive, which would make the gross revenue of the hospital, including the schools, £20,000 a year.

I may be told that in this expenditure I have included other expenses appertaining to the duties of the Governors of Bridewell Hospital. These appear, as well as I can ascertain, to be merely the incarceration of unruly apprentices committed to their charge by the Chamberlain of the City of London. By the Report of 1869 it seems that one apprentice was detained for 21 days, eleven for 14 days, one for 7 days. A note in the Report also says that in six of these cases a part of the period for which the commital had been made out was remitted. They have now ceased to incarcerate unruly apprentices.

Of the salaries of Bridewell Hospital,—which are totally apart from the schools,—the expenditure is no less than £565 16*s.* a year. Of the schools themselves, without reference to the establishment in Bridge Street, Blackfriars, the cost of education and superintendence of the 217 children is no less than £1,840 a year,* a large propor-

* See Report, 1869.

tion of the officials being also boarded and lodged.

Although the pupils of these schools are treated with great kindness, their education is no better than that given in our national schools, and their food and raiment not superior to that of the children in Mr. Spurgeon's or the Clewer Orphanages, yet the amount expended in the salaries of officials is of the most liberal description. Of these, I will submit some items to the reader, and ask whether, in his opinion, they are justifiable or not? I find that to look after the spiritual welfare of these 217 *charity* children there are two chaplains, the senior having a residence, partly furnished, and £450 a year; the assistant, £120. Besides these, schoolmasters, trade instructors, and other persons employed on the establishment number no fewer than 24,—being at the rate of one official or servant for every nine of these charity children.

It would appear, then, that at the lowest computation the *gross* united incomes of these

two charities (the original pauper schools of the Metropolis) will considerably exceed £100,000 a year. That I may not appear guilty of exaggeration, let us assume the joint gross income of both charities to be only £90,000, and then try what might be done with that amount in the furtherance of charitable education. Suppose that, instead of maintaining the 1,200 Blue-coat boys in the present manner, the friends of the pupils were allowed £30 per annum for the board, clothing, and education of each boy, in all £36,000, this would leave £54,000 a year to be accounted for. From this amount should be deducted £7,000 for the blind charity under the management of the Governors of the Blue-coat School, leaving still £47,000 a year to be appropriated to the extension of charitable education. How then could it be applied with the greatest advantage to both the poor and the ratepayer? Of many schemes which might be adopted, I will suggest one.

Although, as before stated, the annual

expenditure of a child in Annerly pauper schools averages £23, in Plashet £25, and in Hanwell £29 a year, it has been proved, by the willingness of Roman Catholics and Jews to maintain the pauper children of their own creeds at an allowance of 6*s.* a week, or £15 12*s.* a year, that that amount is amply sufficient for the purpose. Let us, then, take this rate of cost per child, and see how far the surplus of £47,000 would provide for the maintenance of the children in King Edward's Schools (which were not included in the above calculation), and the pauper district schools. The number of children in these schools is as follows:—

King Edward's Schools . .	300 *
Annerly	792
Plashet	257
Hanwell	1,127
Total	2,476

Calculating, then, the cost of each child at 6*s.* a week, the sum required for the mainte-

* It has been stated that the children to be educated in these schools will for the future reach 300.

nance of the 2,476 children in these schools would be at the rate of £38,600 a year, or £9,000 less than the surplus of the gross revenues of King Edward's Schools and Christ's Hospital put together.

But it may possibly be said that the sum of £30 a year, which I suggested might be allowed for the board, maintenance, clothing, and education of each of the 1,200 Blue-coat boys remaining on the foundation, is too small to allow those having charge of them to procure a good education and maintain them in a proper and efficient manner. In reply, I would, in the first place, remind the reader that the Blue-coat School is essentially a *charity* school, and therefore the strictest economy ought to be observed in the administration of its funds. Let us assume, then, that the most a clerk, with a wife and three children, and a salary of £300 a year, can afford to expend on each child will be £24 a year for food, house-rent, and clothing, this will still leave £6 a year for education alone. This sum, I

submit, is amply sufficient for the purpose, not only to obtain a good commercial education in London, but one of high class also. In proof of my statement I will point out, as an example, the schools belonging to the Stationers' Company, in Bolt Court, Fleet Street, where an education can be obtained ranging from the elementary to that of the standard of the celebrated schools of Eton, Harrow, Westminster, Charterhouse, or King's College, for an average sum of £6 a year. Possibly I, a mere ratepayer, may be accused of presumption in attempting to judge of the comparative value of education in the schools I have mentioned—schools which have on their different Boards of Management names of those who, for profound learning and piety, are unsurpassed in any kingdom in the world. In reply, I submit to the reader that my reasons for arriving at a conclusion of the kind are not given without some data to go upon.

Among those principally interested in the

management of the Stationers' Company's School, all of whom take great interest in its welfare, I find the names of the Master of the Company, Sir Sydney Waterlow; Francis and William Rivington, Esqrs., the publishers; John Murray, Esq., publisher, Albemarle Street; Thomas Longman, Esq., publisher, Paternoster Row; John Gough Nichols, Esq., F.S.A., Parliament Street, Westminster; William Clowes, Esq., Duke Street, Stamford Street; J. Butterworth, Esq., law publisher, Fleet Street, as well as several other publishers of the highest standing in London. Let me now submit to the reader whether it would be possible to form a committee of management in any school more perfectly capable of judging of the value of education? And these gentlemen, let it be understood, unlike those on the committees of many of the other schools I have mentioned, do not accept their office as simply complimentary, but exert themselves personally and energetically in its welfare.

To quote from the prospectus of the Stationers' Company's School, the course of education comprises instruction in the principles of the Christian religion, the English, Greek, Latin, German, and French languages, mathematics, history, geography, book-keeping, writing, drawing, vocal music, drilling, chemistry, and physical science, all of which are taught by first-class professors, under the superintendence of Mr. Alexander Kenedy Isbister, M.A., LL.D., head master. Although there are at present in the school about 200 scholars, and its endowment does not exceed £300 a year, the average cost for education, including stationery, is only £1 10*s.* a quarter, payable in advance—about £6 a year.

To return to the Blue-coat and King Edward's Schools. It must not be imagined that the enormous incomes of these schools will appear by comparison to dwarf the smaller incomes of the numerous other charity schools spread with such immense profusion over the Metropolis. This is

hardly the case; many of the other charity schools having enormous incomes, such as the Charterhouse, Merchant Taylors', Dulwich College, and St. Paul's, all of which are charities, and, as such, under the inspection of the Charity Commissioners. The City Livery Companies have funds in their hands, for charitable education alone, amounting to £19,000 a year. Then, again, the Grey-coat and Green-coat Schools and Emanuel Hospital in Westminster, all purely charitable foundations, possess from all sources an estimated annual income of from £7,000 to £8,000 a year. Assuming the cost of maintenance, education, and clothing of a charity child to be 6*s*. a week, the rental of these charities would be more than sufficient to educate all the street arabs in the city of Westminster not in the Union schools. Add to the surplus above 6*s*. a week for each child in these schools, to the surplus, after the same ratio, in the other metropolitan charity schools, and the gross amount would be

sufficient for the maintenance and education of the whole of the pauper children in London, and leave a large balance beyond it for the purpose of erecting and maintaining school buildings.

CHAPTER IX.

CHARITY SCHOOLS (*continued*).

HAVING shown in the last chapter, to a certain degree, what may be done by the amalgamation of the charitable endowment funds of the Metropolis, if administered according to the uses of the original trusts, I will now call the attention of the reader to the advantages which might be obtained by a fusion of the several different endowed schools in the Metropolis—both those purely educational, and others which partake of a mixed character, partly charitable, partly for free education. And here I may be told that most of our metropolitan institutions are under a Board of Administrators independent of each other; and that it would be

utterly contrary to every principle of law and justice to amalgamate them. But justice, if the word be properly taken, is much the same in all countries, and even in our own there would be no difficulty in showing that a fusion of the kind has not only been admitted as just and honest, and has received the approbation of as shrewd a body of right-thinking men as there exists in the world, but has also been sanctioned and approved by the Government and law authorities. I allude to those schools comprised in the "Endowed Institutions (Scotland) Act." And this I say the more readily as many of our metropolitan institutions — for example, St. Catherine's Hospital and the Charterhouse, as well as others—have combined in their trust, as in the Edinburgh endowments, the maintenance and reception of pensioners. By this Act several of the educational and charitable endowments of Edinburgh have been incorporated under one administration, and the results have been of a most beneficial descrip-

tion. The endowments already amalgamated comprise—

1. George Watson's Hospital; founded by George Watson, accountant of the Bank of Scotland, Edinburgh. He died in 1723, and bequeathed £12,000 to endow a hospital for the maintenance and education of boys. The income of this trust now amounts to about £8,000 a year. The number of boys maintained and educated in the hospital building before the reform was eighty-six.

2. The Merchants' Maiden Hospital; founded 1695 by the Edinburgh Merchants' Company, and widow of James Hair, druggist in Edinburgh, for the maintenance and instruction of girls. The income of the trust is about £6,000 a year, and prior to the changes it contained seventy-five pupils.

3. The Daniel Stewart Hospital; founded by Daniel Stewart, of the Exchequer, who died 1814, leaving upwards of £13,000 to accumulate for the purpose of building and endowing a hospital for the maintenance

and education of boys. The annual income of this trust is upwards of £5,000, and the number of foundationers was sixty-seven.

4. The last of these institutions is James Gillespie's Hospital and Free School; founded by James Gillespie, of Spylaw, merchant and tobacconist in Edinburgh. By his will, dated 1796, he destined the greater part of his property to the endowment of a charitable school for boys, and of a hospital for the aliment and maintenance of old men and women. About forty aged foundationers were maintained in the hospital building. The free school was opened in 1803, and had about one hundred boys. For some time no fees were charged, but subsequently, and until the recent reform, the pupils were made to pay (and this point is well worthy the consideration of the ratepayer) a small sum per month. This charge had the effect of increasing their number, which at last amounted to one hundred and fifty. The annual income of this charity is about £1,800,

making, with the other institutions above named, a gross revenue of £20,800 a year, on which, apart from the cost of the aged persons maintained within the hospital, two hundred and thirty boys and girls were fed, clothed, and educated, and one hundred and fifty boys received an almost gratuitous education.

For upwards of a quarter of a century there has been a growing feeling in Scotland against what is known as the Hospital System;* and, happily, people generally are now coming to believe in the truth of the saying that children should be brought up in families, not in flocks. The education of large numbers of children apart from their parents, relatives, or friends, and without their having almost any intercourse with other persons except the officials of the hospital establishments, was a system unnatural in itself, and not calculated to make

* See a paper read before the British Association, 1871, by Thomas J. Boyd, F.R.S.E., Master of the Merchants' Company.

them in after-life useful members of society. With whatever zeal those who were so brought up might be trained morally and intellectually, many were found, on the completion of their education, to be devoid of that general intelligence which is acquired from intercourse with friends in the home circle; and, when they left the hospitals to begin the business of life, they were, as a rule, unable to take their places with others whose scholastic training had not been superior, but had been carried on under happier circumstances. Altogether, it was felt that, in return for the large sum of money expended on them, comparatively small benefits were derived; and it was to abolish this state of things that the scheme was devised.

In the year 1869, on the representations of the Merchants' Company of Edinburgh, the "Endowed Institutions (Scotland) Act" was brought into Parliament as a Government measure by the then Lord Advocate, Sir James Moncrieff. It encountered consider-

able opposition; but the company having obtained the support of the managers of two or three similar foundations in Scotland in behalf of the measure, it finally passed.

After the Act was passed, a scheme for reforming the four institutions already referred to had to be prepared. To go at any length into the subject would occupy too much of the reader's time, and I will therefore shortly state the results of the amalgamation of these endowed schools. The building of James Gillespie's Hospital was chosen for the lowest grade school of both boys and girls; Daniel Stewart's and George Watson's for the other two boys' schools; and that of the Merchants' Maiden Hospital for the upper girls' school. There were thus five graded schools in the four buildings. For each of these institutions a head-master was appointed, whose emoluments were to consist of a salary, and an additional sum for every pupil who should attend the school over which he was to preside. For the upper girls' school a lady-super-

intendent was also engaged. The foundationers were to attend the school belonging to the trust with which they were connected, and children of the general public who passed an examination suitable to their respective ages, and satisfactory to the Governors, were to be admitted to all the schools on payment of moderate fees.

The course of instruction was designed to include English in all its branches, writing, arithmetic, vocal music, and drill. The boys were also to be taught mechanical drawing, and the girls sewing and knitting. Both male and female teachers were to be employed, and the classes were not to contain more than fifty children. The fees, including the use of school books, have been fixed at 3*s*., 4*s*., and 5*s*. a quarter for the entire course. In Daniel Stewart's and George Watson's schools for boys, the course of study was to include the English, Latin, French, and German languages; writing, arithmetic, book-keeping, algebra, mathematics, drawing,

vocal music, botany, natural history, natural philosophy, chemistry, drill, gymnastics, fencing, and dancing. In both schools male teachers only were to be employed, and the number of pupils in each class was not to exceed a maximum of forty, so that the education of every one of them might be fully attended to. The fees for the whole course have been fixed at from 10*s*. to 30*s*. a quarter.

In the upper girls' school, the course of study was to embrace all the branches usually taught in the principal institutions and boarding schools for young ladies, and to include the English, French, German, and Latin languages; lectures on literature, writing, arithmetic, book-keeping, algebra, mathematics, physical science, drawing, vocal music, instruction on the pianoforte, drill, calisthenics, dancing, and needlework. As in the upper boys' schools, the classes were not to contain more than forty pupils. With the exception of the elementary department, where female teachers only were to be em-

ployed, the institution was to be taught altogether by masters, with a governess attached to each class, to be constantly in attendance upon it. The fees for the whole course have been fixed at from 12*s.* 6*d.* to 50*s.* a quarter. I may mention, that in the second quarter of the session, when the numbers were counted, the whole of the 1,200 girls in this school were being taught English, arithmetic, vocal music, needlework, and dancing; 1,120 writing, 1,032 the pianoforte, 850 French, 672 drawing, and 352 German. In all the schools religious instruction was to be given. I may here state that a "conscience clause" was put in operation. At first, only about ten children took advantage of it, but as the session advanced there was not even a single exception.

And now for the material results of the amalgamation of these schools. After dwelling for some space on the organization and alterations made in the schools since the reform began, Mr. Boyd goes on to say :—

"The advertisements announcing the opening of the day schools appeared about the end of July last year (1870), and as soon as the benefits became known which children attending them would derive, it was evident that the sanguine hopes which had been formed of their success would be fully realised. The same day on which the announcements appeared, a large number of applicants came forward, and day after day they were so numerous, that in about a fortnight no fewer than 2,600 children had passed the entrance examination. Shortly afterwards, the number which could be accommodated in three of the four buildings was made up, there being, inclusive of about 200 foundationers, 3,400 (!) pupils enrolled. . . A most pleasing feature in the movement was the unanimity which prevailed among the members of the Merchants' Company and the Governors, to which I have alluded. There never was a division upon any motion before them. It was this united action which

enabled steady and rapid progress to be made in so short a time. Only a few months had elapsed since the scheme was submitted to the Governors and Company, when the monastic and conventual system of these hospitals, with their 230 inmates, was superseded by the bright work of educating between *three and four thousand children* in a manner compatible with modern requirements."

Let us now try to ascertain what might be effected were a similar plan to that pursued in Edinburgh adopted by some of our London institutions. I may be told that many of these are of a class which entirely precludes the possibility of an arrangement of the kind—those, for example, combining certain charitable trusts for the benefit of adults, together with those for educational purposes, both charitable and free. In both cases the system adopted by the Scotch educational hospital reform points out the way to avoid the difficulty. Attached to more than one of the Edinburgh schools were certain endowments for the mainte-

nance of aged pensioners, somewhat of the same description as the poor brethren in the Charterhouse in London. In Edinburgh, instead of keeping on the conventual system, it was determined to give those who were willing to receive it a sufficient pension to allow them, with economy, and possibly with some assistance from friends, to live where they pleased. Of those pensioners connected with three of the educational trusts, it was decided to maintain a portion in boarding-houses, under the superintendence of the Governors, and to board out the remainder with any persons selected by the pensioners themselves, of whom the Governors might approve. Accordingly, suitable houses were rented, and the plan of the founders carried out. It was agreed that the aged foundationers of Gillespie's Hospital were to have the option given them of either accepting a pension of £25 a year, or of continuing to be supported at the expense of the trust. With the exception of ten, who were old or frail,

they all preferred the pension. As to the future, it is intended to continue the system of giving out-door pensions as much as possible, and at the same time to maintain a small hospital home for the more helpless pensioners.

Let us see what would be the result, if this system were adopted, to one of our large public schools — the Charterhouse, for example. This celebrated school, as the reader is aware, was in Aldersgate Street, in the City. It was founded in 1611, in connection with a hospital for old men, and shares with it an endowment of £29,000 a year. To this, however, should be added the value of house-rent, which would possibly be some thousands a year more. The school has lately been removed to Godalming, where magnificent, even palatial, new schools, raised out of the funds of this *charitable* foundation, have been erected. And here arises a curious question for the ratepayer, whose average income may not exceed £200 a year: whether

the £29,000 a year belonging to the endowment of this charitable foundation, or at any rate a large proportion of it, might not have been expended in London, thereby extending the advantages of education to a far larger, and certainly as meritorious (though a much poorer), class of parents as those for whom the present schools seem solely to be appropriated? I say solely; for if the reader will take the pains to look further into the matter, it will perhaps appear to him, as it does to me, that if those who had been implicated in the present arrangements of the school had been actuated by a special desire to keep the children of those of moderate incomes out of the school, they could not have succeeded better than in the plan they have adopted, even had they built an impenetrable wall of steel around it. For the truth of this statement I beg to refer the reader to a short paragraph extracted from the *Times* newspaper, Saturday, October 5:—

"The new governing body of the Charterhouse have recently passed a resolution which cannot fail to have a most important influence upon the future of the school—namely, that henceforth all nominations to the foundation shall be made, not, as heretofore, by a system of private patronage at the hands of the individual Governors, but by open competition, or examination, as has been already the case for some years at Eton, Winchester, &c. One turn has been reserved to each of the retiring Governors, by way of recognition of what may be regarded as a sort of 'vested interest;' and we understand that of such nominations about ten remain to be made before the new resolution will actually take effect. Henceforth, therefore—that is, from within a few months—there will be no less than sixty scholarships tenable at the school, out of which thirty will be styled 'junior scholarships,' and will be open to all boys between twelve and fourteen years old, whether already in the school or not.

These will be of the value of £60 a year, and will be tenable till the end of the boy's sixteenth year, or till his election to a 'senior scholarship.' The examination for the junior scholarships will be in English, Latin, French, and arithmetic. The 'senior scholarships' will be open to all boys between fourteen and sixteen years of age who shall have been in the school for at least one year, and they will be of the annual value of £80. Besides these, there will be ten exhibitions of the annual value of £20, open to all boys in the school under fourteen years of age. These exhibitions will be tenable until the age of sixteen, and may be held conjointly with junior, but not with senior scholarships. There will also be given away annually five exhibitions of £80 a year, to be competed for by boys leaving the school. These will be tenable for four years at one of the universities or elsewhere, in preparation for any profession or occupation, subject to the approval of the governing body. The con-

sequence of this resolution will be, that while *the fees for tuition and board are fixed at £95 annually*, any promising and industrious boy will be able to reduce in his parents' favour the expenses of his education to £15. We should add that the following is the list of the new Governors:—The Archbishhops of Canterbury and York, the Duke of Buccleuch, the Earls of Devon, Romney, and Harrowby; Lord Chelmsford, the Hon. George Denman, Q.C. M.P.; the Rev. Dr. Oxford, Mr. R. C. Jebb, of Cambridge; Mr. George Bush, F.R.S.; Mr. P. M. Duncan, F.R.S.; and Mr. Gordon Whitbread. All credit, we feel, is due to the governing body for thus voluntarily giving up a system of valuable private patronage in favour of the public at large."

Let the reader bear in mind that the Charterhouse Schools were not instituted for the sole benefit of the wealthy, but are, in the strict sense of the word, charity schools, enrolled under the Charity Commissioners' Act; and that they were not in-

stituted for the benefit of the inhabitants of Godalming, but for those of London. By the present arrangement all day-school education is entirely removed from the class who ought, above all others, to be the recipients of charity—those who are poor and needy. Among the needy may also be ranged those men of small incomes and large families, to whom the benefits of a gratuitous or low-priced education would be far more consistent with the word "charity," than for those who are able to pay for the board and education of their sons for some eight months the enormous sum of £95 a year. Let the reader (if even a man of moderate wealth, with an income, say, of £500 a year) ask himself the question whether he does not know that he could obtain for his son an education of the highest description, including board, for the sum of £95 a year, without drawing on the funds of a charity for the least assistance—whether, in fact, the sum of £95 a year (assuming the school to have

300 scholars) would not be sufficient for their board and education, leaving a balance large enough for the rewards of merit enumerated above, without touching the foundation funds even to the value of a shilling. Again, it must be understood that the £95 a year does not cover all expenses necessary before gaining one of the prizes proposed to be given.

The system of giving such rewards by open competition is plausible enough at first sight; but still it is doubtful whether it should be applied to schools for charitable purposes. The time and expense necessary to grind or coach-up a boy for an examination of the kind is far greater than artisans, small shopkeepers, lawyers' clerks, *et hoc genus omne*, can afford. They are therefore deprived of all benefit from the system. It must also be borne in mind that the Charterhouse is not alone in this matter. It is even proposed to adopt the same system in the poorer endowments, such as the Grey-coat Schools

and Emanuel Hospital. Of its effects in such schools as the Charterhouse, Winchester, and others, I may quote a case in point which a short time ago came under my notice.

A widow lady of very limited means, whose husband had been educated at Winchester, wished to send her son to the same school. Not being able to afford the expense of placing him as an ordinary scholar, she engaged a private tutor to prepare him for the competitive examinations, and after eighteen months he was considered fit to make the attempt. The boy, however, although intelligent and clever, was exceedingly nervous, and broke down at the examination. The £78 which his mother had paid to the tutor, and which she could so ill afford, was lost, and she has since found that the annual sum she would have had to pay at Winchester, even had her son succeeded, is amply sufficient to obtain for him an excellent education, without the slightest difficulty, in London.

Let us now turn to the good effects which might be produced by the amalgamation of some of the wealthier endowments in London, and those of a higher class than that of a purely charity school in the modern acceptation of the term. To stamp this more effectually on the imagination of the reader, I will contrast the management of two schools, in both of which the education is of the highest excellence—the Stationers' Company's Schools and St. Paul's. The former is under the management of the Livery Company whose name it bears, and the latter under the control of the Mercers' Company. It is here unnecessary for me to recapitulate the description I gave in the last chapter of the Stationers' Company's Schools. Suffice it to say, that, even on the admission of the Endowed Schools Commissioners themselves, it would be difficult to suggest in what manner the education might be improved, so admirable are all its arrangements. The reader will remember that the average cost of education

in these schools, including stationery, does not exceed £6 a year. To this should be added the endowment of the schools, which is something under £300 a year.

St. Paul's School (which, by the way, it is proposed, after the example of the Charterhouse Schools, also to remove into the country) partakes by its orginal institution of the double element of a charitable and endowed school. It was founded in the year 1509. Its present income is about £12,000 a year, which will shortly be largely increased. To this amount should also be added the estimated value of the present building, and ground on which it stands, say £1,000 more. The number of scholars is limited to one hundred and fifty-three. Let me ask the reader, as he passes the school, to cast his eye on the boys, who may be seen playing after school hours, through the iron railing which separates the building from the street, and then say if the youths would be recognised as those belonging to every "class,

country, and degree," for which it was originally intended; or where he would find the poor scholar who swept out the schoolroom, and received fourpence from each new boy when he signed his name on his admission. At the same time, I am ready to admit that vast reformation has taken place in this school since it came under the inspection of the Charity Commissioners. One of the abuses annually perpetrated before that happy event was the extravagant apposition dinner. How far this had diverged from the original law of Colet, the benevolent founder, who permitted the managers, out of its funds, to have each year "a littel dinner, the cost thereof not to exceed fowre nobles, and which was to be held as near Candlemas as possible, the time not to exceed three days after or before," remains to be seen. When examining the institution and management of the "charity," they submitted to the Mercers' Company, in their place as governors and trustees of the school, that the yearly sum of £229 was

considerably more in excess of the "fowre nobles" than was altogether justifiable, even after taking into consideration the difference of the value of money in the present day and that in the time of Henry VIII.

The same report of the Charity Commissioners also remarks on several other items of expenditure which appeared to them too liberal, and further suggested that as the school was endowed for the benefit of the poor as well as the rich, the poor ought to receive some of the benefits arising from it. At present, appointments to the school are given by the master and wardens of the Mercers' Company. The boys indisputably receive an excellent education; at the same time not superior to that at the Stationers' Company's School. But not only do there appear to be no poor children in the school, but all are sons of those who could afford to pay liberally for their education. This abuse, no doubt, originated in great part from the adhesion to the absurd rule maintained that the

number of scholars should be limited to one hundred and fifty-three, that being the number of fish St. Peter caught in his net. Those who defend the present administration of the school are apt to quote it as a clause in Dean Colet's endowment. Is this really the case? I can find no clause of the kind in any document left by Colet.

Let me now contrast the advantages at present derived by the population of the City, with what advantages *might* be derived if the school were placed under a different administration.

Let us assume that its present income of £12,000 a year were employed solely for purposes of a first-class education; and that the large increase in the value of its funds, spoken of by the Charity Commissioners, and part of which has already been realised, were applied solely for scholarships, either to Oxford or Cambridge, or the London University. It is assumed that when the promised increase is fully realised it will be at least

£3,000 a year more than at present. Let the present building be sold, with the ground on which it stands, and assume that it only realised £20,000—a sum, when contrasted with what other similarly good sites have lately been realising in the City of London, is not half its value—what might be done with the gross amount? In the first place, the sum of £12,000 a year, its present income, would, at the cost of education given in the Stationers' Company's Schools (£6 a year), give a first-class education to two thousand boys instead of one hundred and fifty-three. The assumed increased value in its funds of £3,000 would allow sixty scholarships to be perpetually on its books of £50 each; while the money realised by the sale of the present buildings and site would suffice to build four schools in different parts of London at £5,000 each, being at the rate of £10 per pupil—an ample allowance.

In making this calculation I have assumed that the education should be gratuitous; but

this, however, has been held, and I believe with great reason, to be a bad policy, and that a moderate amount paid for education raises its value in the eyes of all. Assume, then, that in the two thousand scholars placed on the endowment of St. Paul's the average cost of education should be limited to £4 a head, what an immense boon would such a system be to, not only the poor of the Metropolis, but to thousands of those whose incomes, whether as mechanics, clerks, shopmen, and others, shall be under £300 a year. If, again, a portion of the endowment of the Charterhouse were added to the funds of St. Paul's and the Stationers' Company's Schools —say even to the amount of another £12,000 a year—and the funds similarly applied, would not the whole, with the addition of the Merchant Taylors' and Mercers' Schools, and the other purely educational establishments, go far to form the basis of education for the whole Metropolis, from the elementary, as in Scotland, at 2*s*., 3*s*., and 4*s*. a quarter, up to the

highest class which could be given, as at St. Paul's or the Stationers' Company's Schools?

The waste in the funds of St. Paul's School —in the eyes of the lower middle class and artisan ratepayer—must certainly be very great. But in the lowest depths there is a lower deep. Formerly, on the spot at present occupied by St. Katharine's Docks, were some alms-houses, with a dwelling for a warder or porter, and a school for poor boys. The neighbourhood at the time was of the most wretched and demoralised description, and the property about it almost valueless, for which reason, as well as its convenient position, it was chosen as the site for the present St. Katharine's Docks. Existing interests, however, had to be bought out, and among these the Hospital of St. Katharine. This saint, like a good many others in the City, appears to have been an excellent hand at a bargain, and for this wretched property her trustees obtained from the Dock Company the enormous sum of £160,000. The question

now arose, what was to be done with the funds? and the Lord Chancellor was requested to suggest a plan. He found but little difficulty in the matter. Considering that the inhabitants of Wapping and the London Docks were in a very demoralised condition, hardly suitable to be *protégés* of so celebrated a saint as St. Katharine (who, by the way, had been content with the locality for some six hundred years), he resolved to remove the institution into a more pious district, and at last selected one in the neighbourhood of the Regent's Park. Here some twelve houses were built, to be inhabited gratuitously by decayed ladies and gentlemen of quality, while the senior poor man, or beadle, or warden, or whatever he may be called, had a handsome house erected for his occupation. The present income of this charity is about £12,000 a year. The pensioners, apart from the incomes they receive, generally let out their houses ready furnished, and even occasionally the very seats in the chapel;

while the warden, the Hon. William Ashley, till very lately had, including the value of his house, which he did not live in, but let off, the equivalent of some £2,000 a year to see that the others made themselves comfortable.*

To any objection which may be urged to the possibility of removing the different endowed schools in the Metropolis to other sites, it may be answered that in the case of the Charterhouse Schools a precedent has been admitted, and fully carried out, to the great detriment of the population, by authority of the Lord Chancellor. But as it would be a sin little less than blasphemy in the eyes of the British public to doubt for one moment the infallibility of the Court of Chancery, I will not offend the reader's prejudices by offering any disparaging remarks on that transaction. At

* The trustees of St. Katharine's Hospital educate and partially clothe forty or fifty charity children, the only benefit at present derived, as far as education is concerned, from its funds. Contrast this with the Stationers' Schools.

the same time, it must be admitted that if the removal of a school, to the *prejudice* of the London public, is capable of justification by the Court of Chancery, the removal of another school which would tend to the *benefit* of the London public ought not to be objected to; and a proposition, therefore, to remove St. Paul's School to some more convenient locality in the Metropolis for the children of the great mass of the population should receive due consideration. I may be told that the cost of erecting new schools, together with the purchase of the ground, would be so enormous that little would be gained to the ratepayer and public at large. But it should be taken into consideration that if school buildings could be erected of so mean a description as to be an eyesore to the Metropolis, at the same time too lavish an expenditure may be equally objectionable. There is no doubt that a medium plan might be adopted, whereby commodious schools of simple architecture may be built, and even be an ornament to the Metropolis;

while the tawdry meretricious style, admitted as beautiful by our Governmental and Civic authorities, is to the eye of any person of ordinary taste the sublime of ugliness, as in the case of St. Thomas s Hospital.

Let me now contrast how much good may result in a building erected at a moderate amount of cost, with one in which the expenditure lavished on it has been enormous, and the amount of benefit derived so small as almost to raise the idea that the more money spent, the less useful the results. In Bell Lane, Whitechapel, is an extensive range of school buildings, known as the Jewish Free School. In these buildings, at an average, about 2,600 pupils are instructed. The education runs from the purely elementary, up to the highest class which can be given. Many of the most learned Jews of the present day, whether in law, medicine, or literature, as well as artists, merchants, and bankers, received their education in these schools. The cost of the buildings, accom-

modating 2,600 children, and including the freehold of the ground, did not, I understand, exceed £12,000.

Turn now to Dulwich College. This building, erected under the authority of the Lord Chancellor at a cost of £120,000, is adapted to receive 800 pupils. Much animadversion and emphatic disapprobation, and with reason, has been shown by a large portion of the public at this extravagant expenditure. Now, it may possibly appear reasonable to the reader that if the Jewish Schools, including freehold, have cost £12,000 for 2,600 children, surely the same sum might have been sufficient for another day school for 800.

Several other schools in the Metropolis may also be quoted, as, for example, St. Olave's, Southwark, where the expenditure in the school building has been immeasurably out of proportion to the amount required for the purpose. I could carry on the subject to a far greater extent if I pleased; but I submit that I have already given sufficient proof of

how vast an amount of benefit might accrue to the inhabitants of the Metropolis were the admirable system adopted in Edinburgh, of amalgamating several endowments, carried out in London.

Altogether, the question of our public schools merits the consideration of the ratepayers on two different points. In the first place, there is no doubt, as I trust I have shown, that the excess funds of Christ's Hospital and King Edward's Schools, Emanuel and Grey-coat Hospitals, and other establishments of the same kind, including the Foundling, would, after allowing £30 a year each for board, education, and clothing of 12,000 boys in the Blue-coat Schools, and the cost of all charity children in other schools limited to 6*s*. a week, would leave a surplus sufficient, at the same ratio, for the maintenance, clothing, and education of the whole of the children at present in the Metropolitan pauper district schools maintained out of the poor's-rate. How great the amount the ratepayer has

been contributing to the support of these schools may be judged by the fact that, admitting Christ's Hospital and King Edward's Schools to be the original pauper schools of the Metropolis, after deducting £39,000 a year for the Blind Charity attached to the former, and the board and maintenance of the boys, the excess during the last twenty years would amount to between a million and a million and a quarter sterling. The funds of the other purely educational endowments in London, such as the Mercers' and St. Paul's Schools, the Charterhouse, and others of a similar description, would be sufficient, if analysed, to cover the tax (equivalent to the interest on six millions sterling) about to be levied on the Metropolis by the London School Board.

CHAPTER X.

LIVERY COMPANIES.

I TRUST the reader will admit that I have to a considerable extent fulfilled the promise I made him at the beginning of this work, to prove the force of my arguments by a series of contrasts. But all the contrasts I have hitherto brought forward sink into utter insignificance when compared with the present condition of our City Livery Companies and their original organization. It would perhaps seem scandalous on my part to say that these companies are not honestly managed. Again, if I did so, I should make the assertion blindfold, and not from any result of investigation; for, although I have taken some trouble in the matter, I have been

unable to obtain, except to a very limited degree, any decided particulars capable of bearing out my statement. It must, however, be clear to all that, assuming that the Livery Companies ought to be carried out as closely as possible to the intention of their original organization, great deviations from the intention of the founder have been made, and are to be found among them.

The Livery Companies, as I before stated, were established principally to carry out two great ends—the regulation, in a business point of view, of the particular trades or crafts bearing their name, and as trade benefit societies; the latter being, after all, of the two the object of the greater interest.

Let us take for example the Mercers' Company, which was solely established, as far as its benefit funds went, as a means for affording relief and assistance in poverty and sickness to their brethren in the "mystery of mercerie." In the year 1701, Sir William Gore, a member of the Mercers' Company,

was chosen Lord Mayor of London. In his speech at the dinner which afterwards took place in the Guildhall, he complimented the brethren of the "mystery of mercerie" on having always kept their members solely to those of the trade. At the present time I believe there is not a member of the company who is in the trade, or, if any, the number must be very small. The enormous trade-funds of the company, as well as its charities, are administered by a self-elected body of men, having no connection with the trade they are supposed to represent, while perhaps all trading in merchandise of the description are exempted from any benefits from the company's funds.

A very slight inspection of the original charters of our City Companies will clearly prove that, although instituted to a considerable degree for trade purposes, they were more so as benefit societies of the different trades and crafts then practised in London. And it should be borne in mind that

these companies were not simply trades, but crafts or handicrafts as well, and some of these among the wealthiest of the Livery Companies. I will quote two as examples—the Goldsmiths' and the Merchant Taylors'. In the first place, in these, as in common with all other trades and crafts in the City of London, no person was admitted as a freeman who had not passed through his apprenticeship; and then, after a searching inquiry had been made into his ability and respectability, he was admitted as a freeman of the craft or trade upon payment of certain fees regulated by the company themselves. In the history of the Goldsmiths' Company may continually be found allusions to the artificers and commonalty, as well as apprentices, freemen, and wardens. For example, in the year 1529 a dispute arose between the artificers and poor men of the craft of goldsmiths—the latter complaining that in the election of master and wardens, &c., they had a right to vote, but had been prevented. Assuming that the

artificers in the goldsmiths' trade are those most worthy to be recipients of the benefit funds of the company, it would be curious to inquire how much of the enormous sums at the disposal of the company reaches them. The treatment of the artificers of this company by the Corporation of the City of London appears to have been most iniquitous. By the destruction of their dwellings they have been driven as a body out of the City, while the different charities and funds, so lavishly bequeathed in the Middle Ages, or when the artificers and governors of a company formed one large benefit society, are now lost to them. Nay, more, so completely have they been separated from the parent institution, that they have been obliged to form similar benefit societies of their own, to which the opulent in the trade either contribute in the meanest possible manner or not at all. What the real funds of the Goldsmiths' Company are it would be difficult to say; but I find that their hall alone is rated at £5,500 a year.

This, with taxes, would certainly give the value of at least £7,000 or £8,000 a year, without in any manner whatever interfering with the salaries of officials and persons employed in the assay department, feasting, and establishment charges. Suppose now that the whole of the funds of the Goldsmiths' Company were left in the possession of the present governor and wardens and the freemen of the company; that £2,000 a year from the amount of rent and taxes were left in their hands to compensate them for the assay duties they perform for Government; and that the remaining £5,000 or £6,000 a year were handed over to the artificers' benefit societies in Clerkenwell, it would be found amply sufficient, not only to maintain all decayed members of the craft, but for the (in great part) gratuitous education of their children as well, without any expense to the parents, or call for assistance on the ratepayer.

But perhaps a still more glaring instance of the utter departure of one of our Livery Com-

panies from the original incorporation is the Merchant Taylors' Company. Vast, indeed, are the efforts which have been made by the different modern members of that aristocratic body to prove that the title of the company is a misnomer; that they were, to the fullest extent of the word, merchant princes; and that their school, the Merchant Taylors', was instituted only for the sons of the wealthy, or those of aristocratic descent. A more impudent falsehood it would be utterly impossible to imagine. It has simply been conjured up for the purpose of blinding the eyes of the public at large to the wholesale frauds which for more than a century and a half have been perpetrated, to a greater or less degree, on the funds entrusted to the managers. Of the Merchant Taylors' School, Dr. Wilson, in his History (1812), speaks, *with pride*, that there were not ten pupils to be found among the boys in the school whose parents were in any way connected with the trade. Herbert also, in his "History of the Twelve City Livery

Companies" (1836), says: "The Taylors' and Drapers' Company anciently went hand in hand, not as members of the same fraternity, but as equally contributing to furnish the necessary article of clothing; and notwithstanding the attempts to exalt them above their seemingly servile origin, and to make their change of name from 'Taylors' to 'Merchant Taylors'—a result of their being merchants in cloth—it is certain that not only at first were the "cissors" *bonâ fide* cutters and makers of upper clothes, but the company itself was a working one. . . . . There are not at present half-a-dozen tailors brothers of this dignified corporation, which shows how vividly the City Companies have deviated from their original institution."

Machyn, in his "Diary," 1555, speaking of the "Marchand's tayller's fest," held on the 2nd of July in that year, states that all the wardens of the company were not only tailors, but tailors' sons. As a proof that civic hospitality was well known in those

days, even when the craftsmen had some share in the funds of the company, Machyn continues, that "thay had agaynst ther dener 8 bokes (bucks) and 2 stages (stags)." "When it is recollected," continues a note in the Appendix of the modern edition of his "Diary," "that the great City historian Stowe was a tailor of London, and his contemporary Speed, the general historian, as well as Antony Munday, Thomas Middleton, and others, besides a fair proportion of the distinguished civic senators and benefactors of former days, there can be no reason to despise the brethren of this very necessary craft at any stage of its history, even if, besides 'manufacturing pavilions for our kings, robes of state for our nobles, and tents, &c., for our soldiers,'* they all condescended to become makers of ordinary garments, by stitching jerkins for our apprentices, doublets for our shopmen, and trunk-hose for our cooks."

* Wilson, p. 19.

Then, again, many other companies, at present containing in their confraternity few or no members of the commonalty or craft, have considerable funds at their disposal, intended originally "not only for the Liverymen, but the working man as well." Of these I will quote the Brewers' Company, and that too from its earliest origin. To show how completely the craftsmen or working men of the Livery were considered members of the Corporation, may be seen from an order issued by the wardens on the 13th of February, 1422: "That on the occasion of the King's visit to the City, all housekeepers of their company, and all the Brewers' men, of a salary of 40*s.* a year, should provide themselves with new clothes to do honour to his Majesty."

The Leathersellers and Curriers will also come under the same category. The treatment the latter has received is, if possible, more unjust than that of the Goldsmiths and Tailors, for it is even now illegal to carry on

their craft in the City, as being prejudicial to health. Of the Drapers', Haberdashers', and other companies, there are but few of the trade among its confraternities. Once, when dining out at one of the magnificent banquets of the Dyers' Company, I asked one of the Livery if there were any members really of the trade among them. He replied—"In that respect we differ from many of the other companies, for we have *one*, and you see him sitting on the other side of the table." I could not learn from him whether the working men of the craft received the slightest benefit from it: he believed not.

But the reader may naturally ask, in what manner does all this concern the ratepayer, which he understood to be the main object of the present work? In reply, I submit that the subject is one of immense importance to the ratepayer, whether directly as householder, or indirectly as a lodger. No inconsiderable number of those of the poor coming on the rates, and those the most to be pitied

for the degradation *pauperism* brings with it, are the disabled members of trades, and their destitute wives and families; and, if it can be proved that they are entitled to a less objectionable sort of relief, it would be a great advantage both to the ratepayer and the recipient. And can any one imagine that the funds possessed by the different Livery Companies are not sufficient to take a vast number of poor artisans and their families off the rates? By the report of the Charity Commissioners, it appears that, without calculating house-rent of the different charitable institutions, the purely charitable funds in the hands of the City Companies amount to not less than £110,000 a year. How much of this sum, if any, reaches the members of the crafts for which it was originally intended? I may be told that considerable charitable funds were left to the management of the different companies for special purposes apart from the trades. This I grant; but at the same time I deny that a tithe of

the surplus ever reaches those for whom the funds were originally intended.

Then, again, another gross inconsistency may be detected in the administration of the charitable funds in the hands of our City Companies. Legacies, apart from trade purposes, were generally bequeathed to the management of the wardens of the company by one of its members, the whole body of the company being then of the craft or trade for which it was originally instituted. At the present time, however, the contrary would be the rule, for in the administration of these funds not a fourth of the parties are of the trade or craft into whose hands the amount was originally entrusted. Again, it should be borne in mind that a great portion of the funds at present held by the City Companies were from grants made to them for charitable and other purposes on the dissolution of the monasteries. Even some of their halls were originally portions of convent buildings, as for example the Leathersellers', Pinners',

and others. How much of the funds originally intended for "benefit" purposes are at present applied to civic feasting, it would be curious to ascertain. When reading in the columns of the newspapers the report of some magnificent banquet given by one of the City Companies, to which divers of the judges, nobility, and bishops were invited, it appears to me that a certain sermon preached by Bishop Latimer, at Paul's Cross, might, by altering the words "abbots and priors," to chancellors and judges, be as applicable now as at that day. In a letter written by Thomas Dorset, curate of St. Margaret's, Lothbury, to the Mayor of Plymouth, he says:—

"On Sundaye last the byshope of Worcetre preched at Paulis Crosse, and he saide that byshopes, abbatis, prioris, parsonis, canonis resident, pristis, and all, were strange thevis, ye dukis, lordis, and all; the kyng, quod he, made a marvelles good acte of parliament that certayne men sholde sowe every of theym ij acres of hempe, but it was all to

litle, were it so much more, to hange the thevis that be in England. Byshopis, abbatis, with soche other, should not have so many servauntes, nor so many dysches, but to goo to their first foundacion, and kepe hospitalytie to fede the nedye people, not jolye felowis with goldyn chaynes and velvet gownys, ne let theym not onis come into the howsis of religioun for repaste; let theym call knave byshope, knave abbat, knave prior, yet fede non of theym all, nor their horses, nor their doggis."

Possibly if we had a Latimer Bishop of Worcester in the present day, who would stand forth and attack those who maladminister the inheritance of the poor, he might do a great service, not only to the poor themselves, but to the poor ratepayer also.*

* As a proof of the lavish expenditure of our City Companies, I will submit to the reader the following expenses of seven of the most influential, for house-rent and bare establishment charges alone, and then let him judge if I have in any way overstated my case. In this calculation I take the rent of each at the value set down by the City Assessment Committee. To

But I submit that, apart from any pecuniary consideration, another great benefit might be derived from the Livery Companies being re-organized in somewhat the same manner as they were originally instituted. It would bring together employer and employed in a far more satisfactory way than at present, and do more to abolish strikes and

this I have added for rates levied, probable repairs, insurance, wear and tear of furniture, wages and board of clerks and household servants alone, at an amount equal to the rent. The following then would be their annual expenditure for these items alone :—

Clothworkers'	£10,000
Drapers'	16,000
Fishmongers'	7,000
Goldsmiths'	11,000
Merchant Taylors' . . .	6,060
Grocers'	8,000
Salters'	6,000
	£64,060

Now this sum represents something like the interest on two millions sterling, merely for house room for a body of gentlemen, not one, perhaps, in twenty being members of the trades specified. The sum of £64,060 would be sufficient to allow 4,370 decayed *members of the trades* annuities of fifteen pounds a year each. Would not that be a more legitimate application of the money in the eyes of most honest men?

lock-outs than all the laws which have already been passed on the subject. The working man should be taught (and, with the natural shrewdness of our artisans, they would learn the lesson very easily were it pointed out to them) that in the organization of the present Trades' Unions there are many faults. In common with the original City Guilds, the present Trades' Unions are instituted partly for trade purposes and partly as benefit societies. On the advantages which accrue to the working man in the matter of wages I pass no opinion. But it surely must be very clear to our working men, if rightly put before them, that in their benefit clubs, by ignoring the employers, they simply shut out those who are best able to contribute to their funds, those who in the Middle Ages were the principal benefactors of their class; while at the same time the employers drew less on the funds than poorer members who subscribed the least. Whatever provocation the employers may receive from their workmen in the matter

of strikes, there can be hardly any valid excuse offered for them because of their indifference to the wants of the craftsmen by whose labours they have to a great extent obtained the enormous fortunes which many of them possess. It was stated a short time since, in one of the papers, that a certain railway engineer had received for his fee the sum of £400,000 for one line. I know nothing of that gentleman one way or the other, and am perfectly ready to admit that he is a very benevolent man; but, at the same time, I have not heard of any gratuity that he has given to the benefit societies of those working engineers who have carried out his design. Then, again, take the case of the late Mr. Brassey. This gentleman left, beyond his freehold property, some nine millions of money, all of which, admitting his good common sense and unblemished integrity, he made through the labours of the working classes. I should be sorry to do his memory an injustice, but I believe there were no

legacies for charitable purposes in his will. And the same might be said of many others.

Again, on the other hand, artisans are apt to unduly depreciate the good feelings of their employers, and this, in all probability, might, to a considerable degree at least, subside were they brought more directly into communication with each other, as was formerly the case. During the late tailors' strike I inquired of two large employers whether, in case the men would join with them, they would agitate for the re-organization of the Merchant Taylors' Company, so as to restore it to its original intention, and thus bring about a better feeling between employer and employed. They both told me they should be most happy to take part in a movement of the kind, and were fully persuaded the other employers in the trade would do the same. I next applied to some of the leading men conducting the strike. I told them of the large funds possessed by the Merchant Taylors' Company,

and the willingness of some of the employers to join in an agitation to restore, if possible, not merely the original organization for trade purposes, but the large charitable and educational endowments, the funds of Merchant Taylors' School, with the value of the building and ground it stood upon, being sufficient to educate—as far as elementary education went—the sons of every tailor in London, from the richest to the poorest, without coming on their parents for assistance.

"That's all very well," was the reply I received, "but that's not the question, sir."

"What is the question, then?" I inquired.

"Well, it's labour and capital, serfs and tyrant masters, and the time log."

I endeavoured to explain that those questions might be considered in an amicable manner by them together with their masters, after they had obtained possession of the funds which really belonged to them; but, finding at that moment the angry feeling amongst the men against their employers was so

strong, I felt it was useless to argue further, and gave it up.

But might not the present time be appropriate for a re-opening of the question? On a little consideration, the journeymen tailors might be brought to perceive the advantages of a movement of the kind; and were it to succeed, the great wealth possessed by that company, in addition to the amount to be paid by those who joined it, would, in the aggregate, form a revenue sufficiently large to relieve the working tailor from the dread of being obliged to apply in time of distress to the Poor Law for relief, besides securing the ratepayer from any call on the rates for his maintenance.

Another subject also should be considered by the general body of ratepayers: the amount of taxation resulting from the waste lands, in the City especially, at present remaining idle. Although I alluded slightly to the ejectment of the poor in a former chapter, and the amount of waste and unpro-

ductive land caused thereby, I trust the reader will excuse me if I speak once more on the subject. It is true that latterly much of this has been covered, and more is in preparation to be built on; but the whole is small indeed when compared with the space still unappropriated. A short time since, on leaving the Farringdon Street Railway Station and advancing in the direction of the Holborn Viaduct, I counted one hundred paces (three hundred feet), which formed not a hundredth part of the space unoccupied in the locality. If the hundred yards were calculated for ground-rent at £4 per foot for the two sides of the road—£2 on each—it would amount to £1,200 a-year. Assume the hundred yards built over, and the rating levied at only double the ground-rent, it will appear that on that space alone for ground-rent and rates there is an annual loss of £3,600. But the ground has been remaining unproductive for at least twenty years, and a loss of no less than £72,000 has been made up out of the pockets

of the ratepayers. If the reader, the next time he visits the neighbourhood of Farringdon Street, will merely glance at the amount of ground uncovered, and work out the sum in the same manner, he may easily judge of the enormous loss incurred by the ratepayers by its being allowed to stand idle.

I may be told, as I frequently have been, that this fact does not touch the question of the rating of the Metropolis in general; that the ground was purchased by funds levied from the City itself, and consequently ought not to be taken as a portion of the general expenditure of the Metropolis. This certainly is the case as far as ground-rent is concerned, but not from the general rates; the Metropolis at large having a full right to their proportion for the general expenditure. It is also frequently argued that the City Corporation would vigorously oppose any interference with the management. As far as the Corporation is concerned, this may be the case, but not to the extent that is imagined. Among

those resident in the City a very angry feeling prevails against the useless expenditure and the taxation placed on them. In no class is this more readily to be perceived than among the retail shopkeepers, who complain most bitterly of the injury done to trade by the destruction of house property—dwellings of the poor especially. "I used to sell every week twenty-four canisters of tea over my counter," said a retail grocer to me one day; "at present, sir, I don't sell three. All my customers have been driven away. We are paying an enormous amount of taxes to defray the interest for the money expended to purchase and destroy their houses, and the ground has remained so long unoccupied that the interest, at five per cent., would in many cases amount to as much as would have purchased twice over the fee-simple of the ground." *

* The parish of St. Anne's, Blackfriars, extending from Ludgate Hill to the river, at present affords an excellent proof of the merciless ejectment of the poor which has lately taken

He also brought under my notice another beautiful specimen of civic legislation. The neighbourhood of Field Lane and other portions of Farringdon Street were formerly the localities in which most of the bad characters of the City resided. The buildings in Bridewell and the Counter not being sufficient for the reception of the prisoners, the City prison at Holloway was determined on, and £120,000, apart from the value of the ground, was raised by taxation from the citizens for that purpose. The prison was built in a most costly manner, opened, and Bridewell closed. The Corporation then determined to carry out a grand plan of reformation, *more suo*. They determined, now they had built the prison, to drive out all the bad characters who were

place in the City. Ten years since, this parish was so densely crowded with the working classes that the rate in it for the relief of the poor alone amounted to no less than 8*s*. in the pound. The *Times* newspaper office paid annually £280 for poor's-rate alone, and Apothecaries' Hall £190. At present, in consequence of the destruction of the dwellings of the poor for civic improvements, the amount required for the relief of the poor within the parish does not exceed fourpence in the pound.

intended to inhabit it from the City of London by destroying their dwellings. As the reader is aware, the movement was attended with great success; or, if not aware of it, he may judge of its truth from the following fact. The prison was erected for an equal number of male and female prisoners. There are now so few bad characters of the latter sex left in the City, that every lady at present in trouble in the Holloway prison is standing at a cost for house-rent to the citizens of no less than £74 a year, and that without establishment charges or other expenses.

But the City Corporation are not the only sinners to whose charge this fearful waste of rateable property is to be laid. The Metropolitan Board of Works are at least as much to blame, in the City and Southwark, as well as in other parts. And here, again, I may be excused if I bring forward another instance of the harsh manner in which the poorer ratepayers and working classes have been treated by the different improvements

which have been carried out by these two bodies and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. And this was not only by their raising no opposition to the Bills when before Parliament, but their in many instances positively encouraging them. I will take one example of the manner in which the poor were treated on the formation of the Ludgate Hill extension of the London, Chatham, and Dover line. When this line was projected, the Company applied to Parliament for their Bill, and requested the parochial authorities to assist them by a petition to the House. I remember at the time asking one of the guardians of the poor (an influential tradesman) whether the parochial authorities would comply with the request of the company?

"Comply with it!" he said; "of course we shall. Why, just consider what effect it will have on the parish rates It will destroy many hundreds of houses, and those especially inhabited by the class who draw most heavily on the poor's-rates. Why, sir, if that

line is carried through, before the end of four years it will reduce our rates fully threepence or fourpence in the pound."

The impolitic and cruel action of the Metropolitan Board of Works in Southwark, in destroying the dwellings of the working classes, and then leaving the ground utterly profitless for the ratepayer, may be judged from the formation of the new street in Southwark, made to connect Westminster with the Borough. Here again parochial influence was strong, and instead of making the line by the shortest and cheapest road, at the same time ejecting the fewest inhabitants, it was constructed in its present direction solely on account of the improvement (?) which it was urged would be effected by the destruction of the squalid hovels and densely inhabited dwellings of the poor in that locality. This enormous new street is not yet half rebuilt. I mentioned the advantages which would accrue to the ratepayer by its being covered with dwellings, to a member of

the Metropolitan Board of Works, before the demolition commenced, and asked him whether they did not intend to make some provision for the poor about to be ejected. "My dear sir," he replied, "we shall be most happy to entertain any proposition of the kind, if made to us, I assure you. We are influenced, believe me, by most philanthropic intentions." Three years later I mentioned the subject to him again, and reminded him that nothing had been done. "Then, why don't you do it?" he replied. "The Board would willingly entertain any proposition on the subject which might be brought before them. But," he continued, "if your time is valuable, let me give you a hint. Before you attempt to raise funds for building any dwellings for the poor, or even those for the lower middle classes, inquire the price of the land on which the houses are to be erected. And, understand me, even if that does not deter you, it is by no means certain we shall accept your offer."

"Why not?" I asked.

"Because," he replied, "as far, at any rate, as concerns the working classes, it may be considered by those who have already built houses as tending to reduce the value of property in the locality."

"Why should you take them into consideration?" I inquired.

"Well, it would be a hard thing to injure those who have already expended their money in building handsome houses. But there is another and still stronger reason which renders it very probable that the Board would object to buildings for the working and lower middle classes being erected in the neighbourhood."

"And what may that be?" I inquired.

"That the erection of such houses might injure the value of land for building purposes still unlet."

In the eastern and western districts of the Metropolis the same system prevails. In the western, as the reader must be aware, not a fourth part of Victoria Street and the adjacent

property is yet covered with buildings, nor are any even contemplated—and this solely because of the enormous price demanded for the land by those holding it; for were the price reduced, there is no doubt the whole space would be covered rapidly. If the reader were to inquire what is the amount of rates at present levied, both in the parish of St. Margaret's, Westminster, and the general metropolitan fund, from those houses already erected, he will be able to form some proximate idea of the enormous loss which has accrued to the ratepayer during the last thirty or thirty-five years the ground has remained unproductive.

In the neighbourhood of the Strand also may be seen another powerful example of this system of the destruction of the dwellings of the working classes. I allude to the space at present appropriated for building the new Law Courts. Some few years since the whole of the immense space was covered with dwellings, many of them of a bad quality certainly,

but still they afforded shelter to some respectable small tradesmen, artisans, and their families. Beyond these were many houses let at heavy rents, paying large amounts in rates. The better portion of these were used for attorneys' offices, and some few for warehouses. When it was determined that the Law Courts should be built in this parish, the whole rate-producing power, which was considerable in this locality, was destroyed, and the amount of loss has since been thrown upon the ratepayers of the Metropolis. And apart from the more respectable or wealthy portion of the inhabitants, more than four thousand of the working classes were ejected from their dwellings to find a home where they could, no provision being made for their reception elsewhere. Nor is this all. They were positively driven away before it was absolutely decided that the new Law Courts should be built there; and while the promoters of the scheme have been wrangling amongst themselves whether, after all, it

was the best spot that could be selected for the purpose, the ground has remained utterly unproductive and useless. Let the reader, as he passes up the Strand, glance at the appearance it now presents. Would it be possible to imagine a more complete picture of desolation? We have of late years had very lamentable accounts of the destruction of those portions of the city of Strasbourg which during the siege were principally exposed to the fury of the German artillery. But those whose houses were destroyed would possibly form not one tithe of the English working people who have been driven out of this one locality. There is, however, a great difference to be remarked in the contrast. No sooner had the Germans entered Strasbourg, than one of their first cares was to erect new dwellings in place of those destroyed. But not a house has been erected, or the slightest shelter provided, for those who have been driven away to make room for the new Law Courts, if even the project should be carried out.

In the eastern district the same system is also pursued. Should the reader be going towards the Eastern Counties Railway, and will notice in the neighbourhood of Bishopsgate Street the enormous destruction of dwellings being carried on, and the little attempts that are made to cover the ground with new ones, he will perceive that there must be a heavy loss to the ratepayers at large. The formation of Commercial Street and the approaches to the docks in Whitechapel also prove this to be the case; the dwellings of no fewer than fourteen thousand of the working classes having been destroyed.

CHAPTER XI.

CONCLUSION.

APART from the loss which the ratepayers at large sustain by the immense space of ground yet to be built upon in the centre of the City, Southwark, Shoreditch, Whitechapel, and the most valuable parts of the West-end, another question should be considered by them—whether houses, either in carcases or fully built, or those which have been already occupied, when lying empty, should not be liable to the rates as far as the ground-rent is concerned, or in cases of freehold the proportionate ground-rent. Some short time since, one of the wealthier parishes in the west-end of town had in houses finished but not yet occupied, as well as empty houses, no less than

£50,000 a year of rateable value lying idle. The whole of this amount had been included in the general returns of the rateable value of the parish; yet the tenants of those houses occupied had not merely to pay their own rates, but indirectly the rates of those houses lying empty as well, while the freeholders were receiving the ground-rent on the houses as regularly as when they were in full occupation.

Although the mischief done was not very great, a singular proof of the power of a landlord to adopt a policy obnoxious to the ratepayers may be shown in the case of the old woman who lately died in Stamford Street, Blackfriars. In consequence of some family dispute, she appears to have determined that the whole of the house property which had been bequeathed to her should fall into a state of utter ruin, and unfortunately for the ratepayers, though fortunately for the charities to which she left her money (possibly a long-calculated offering for the benefit of her soul), she lived sufficiently long to

carry out her determination. If the reader is not past middle age, he must remember from his childhood some houses in the Blackfriars Road, at the corner of Stamford Street, as well as several in the street itself, as being in process of gradually falling to pieces. The firm determination of this vindictive old woman to carry out her project completely, may be judged from the following fact. About a dozen years since some miserable outcasts who had been in the habit of sleeping under the railway arches, and had been driven from thence by the police, attempted, through the area door in the kitchen, to find shelter in one of those deserted houses. For this infringement of her solemn determination, she applied to a magistrate for redress, and the indignant majesty of the law was brought to bear upon the wretched creatures who had found shelter in these condemned houses. The doors again were then scrupulously nailed up, and the houses left to crumble to dust.

But the houses in Blackfriars were not the only ones belonging to this amiable old lady which met with such treatment. Before the improvements were made for the Holborn Hill Viaduct, there were then on the most valuable part of Snow Hill several houses whose forlorn appearance quite matched that of the Blackfriars houses. Year after year they were allowed to remain empty, and notwithstanding their vicinity to Field Lane, and the swarms of poor outcasts driven from their wretched dwellings by City improvements, who had then collected in the neighbourhood, the doors were hermetically closed, and the houses left to ruin. Again, in the oval on the north side of St. Clement's Church, in the Strand, were several other houses in a similar condition, belonging to the same old lady.

Now, when assessing the property in these different localities for the rates, the value of these separate houses was taken into the calculation, and the aggregate, it may easily be imagined, amounted to a considerable

sum. Yet not a farthing of that sum was contributed by the old woman, but had to be made up by the other ratepayers in the parishes in which they were situated.

The question, then, is, whether the sum paid to the ground landlord ought not to be charged to its full value for the rates, it being borne in mind that when occupied the tenant of the house paid upon that value, including ground-rent. If this plan were adopted throughout the Metropolis, it would certainly make a considerable reduction in the rates. But it has been argued, and with no little reason, that the ground landlords ought to be amenable to the rates on the full amount of ground-rents they receive. If so, calculating the ground-rent at one-tenth of the full rent of the houses, here would at once be a reduction of ten per cent. of the rates paid by the tenant. No doubt the justice of a theory of the kind would be vigorously disputed by every ground landlord, and possibly with some reason, though not to as full an extent

as might at first sight be imagined. There can be no doubt that the making and maintaining of roads, keeping pathways in repair, lighting, improvements in the widening of thoroughfares, and in the formation of public gardens and parks, all tend to raise the value of property; but for this the tenant in possession alone has to pay, the ground landlord, whether the house be full or empty, being exonerated from all contribution.

Another subject ought also to be entertained: whether public buildings—Palaces, Houses of Parliament, Government Offices, Exchanges, the Tower, Woolwich Arsenal, Deptford Dockyard, Greenwich Hospital, and other Government institutions—ought not, in common with the houses of the average-class shopkeeper, to be fully rated, the amount levied to be paid out of the Consolidated Fund? It cannot be disputed that no inconsiderable portion of the poor's-rates and other objects of municipal taxation are greatly increased by the Government establishments.

Again, another subject should be taken into consideration—the formation of new parks and gardens. These are likely to entail a considerable expense on the ratepayer, though by a little management and tact it might be greatly lessened. Some years since, when it was in contemplation to build the new Law Courts on the spot at present decided on, I heard it casually mentioned by a gentleman that it was a pity to go to such an enormous expense for the purchase of ground when the square of Lincoln's Inn Fields would not only be more convenient, but would cost nothing, as there was no legitimate owner for it. It was argued, on the other hand, that to build there would be to block up one of the air-cells in the Metropolis, and that thereby a gross injustice would be done to the population at large, and to the poorer classes in particular, who receive great benefit in a sanitary point of view from its remaining uncovered. Without touching on what sort of benefit the poor creatures de-

rived who were so ruthlessly driven from the spot, at present lying waste, for the commencement of the Law Courts, his remark that Lincoln's Inn Fields had no owner struck me forcibly; and this the more as at that time I was trustee for one of the houses on the north side of the square, for which I knew a certain amount was paid annually for keeping the gardens in order, although I was not aware to whom the money was paid. At last I discovered the gentleman who acted as treasurer. He told me that the whole of the funds collected were used for maintaining the gardens in proper order, but he was unable to say who was the real owner, or on what title they were held. Determined, if possible, not to be baffled, I made many inquiries of the owners of the property round the square, but not one among them, though all were lawyers, could give me the slightest information. I could trace that in the middle of last century the garden was unenclosed, and appears to have been almost like com-

mon ground, and was notorious as being the resort of the most infamous and degraded characters. At that time Sir Thomas Jekyll, Master of the Rolls, was proceeding in the middle of the day across the ground to take his seat in court. When he reached the centre of the present enclosure he was stopped by footpads and robbed. The event created considerable scandal, and it was determined, to prevent any further occurrence of the kind, to enclose the whole space, and the present iron railings around the square were erected at that time. A short time since, when it was in agitation to erect a public garden somewhere in the neighbourhood, a suggestion was indirectly made to members of the Metropolitan Board of Works to see how far Lincoln's Inn Fields might be appropriated for the purpose, and a further call on the ratepayers avoided. It was not denied that the gardens would be a great boon to the poorer and middle classes resident in the neighbourhood, there being

scarcely a spot of ground within the whole area of the Metropolis better adapted for the purpose; but the suggestion was treated with utter indifference, if not with contempt. No steps were taken in the matter, and it was simply argued that they might be offending many of the big-wigs of the law by encroaching on their privileges. One of the members objected on the ground that it would be impossible to keep such gardens in anything like good order, as the crowds of roughs who would assemble on Sundays and holidays would destroy everything.

It is possible, however (if my radical notions may not be displeasing to the reader), that this accusation, so constantly brought against our working classes, is little better than a foul slander. It was argued when the Tower was first thrown open to the public that the roughs would destroy everything that came under their hand, and yet I believe it would be difficult to point out a single

instance of wanton destruction or unruly conduct among the hundreds of thousands of the working classes who have visited that institution. Again, when the South Kensington Museum was first opened, many objected to the unrestrained admission of the working classes to view the picture galleries, affirming that there was no doubt they would soon be injured or destroyed by them; yet so far was this from being the case, that an act of disorderly conduct in that museum has I believe been unheard of.

And here a very singular contrast may be drawn between the behaviour of our working classes, if treated with courtesy and confidence, and that of the upper classes, the *crême de la crême* of society. Shortly after the opening of the museum her Majesty held a Drawing-room, which was inconveniently crowded. So great was the crush, and so disorderly the behaviour of the Court ladies and gentlemen on the occasion, that not only were the dresses of the ladies almost torn from their

backs, but the strong brass balustrades erected for marking the proper entrance into the rooms were fairly broken down. But great as was the crowd at the Drawing-room, it was trifling in comparison with that which thronged the South Kensington Museum in the evening, and those composing it were chiefly of the working classes. By way of preserving order, and to prevent crushing in a long narrow room containing many of the gems of the exhibition, two small wooden uprights were erected at each end, about four feet distant from the walls. From one to the other of these was drawn a mere common tape, the object of the whole being to show those who entered the room the side they were to examine first, and to return by the other, so as to cause as little confusion as possible, there being only one door to the room. The plan succeeded admirably. So orderly was the behaviour of the immense crowd of visitors to the museum that evening, that neither of the wooden uprights were

removed from their position, nor was the tape running between them broken.

But in their respect for gardening, the working classes of London are even more to be admired. Any one who has visited the beautiful Victoria Park, in Bethnal Green, which was principally formed for the enjoyment of the working classes, will admit that as much good order, and care of the flowers and shrubs, prevail there as in Hyde Park itself. And yet the visitors in Hyde Park are almost all of the aristocracy, while those of the Victoria Park are as completely of the working classes. Yet it requires five times as great a police force on duty to maintain order in aristocratic Hyde Park as in the people's park in Bethnal Green, where the crowds of visitors are far denser than in the former. Surely, with such facts as these, the fear for Lincoln's Inn Fields being thrown open to the public must be admitted to be groundless.

To return to the ratepaying question. It

must not be imagined that the present rates levied on the Metropolis are to continue without further increase. On the contrary, an enormous amount of municipal taxation is looming in the future. As before stated, the Poor-law Board are exercising all their ingenuity (in imitation of the working of the Court of Chancery) in municipal and charitable matters, that the smallest possible amount of benefit should be derived at the heaviest possible amount of cost. Fresh lunatic asylums are projected, each of which will cost at least from £150,000 to £200,000. It is proposed also to buy up the whole of the tolls of the bridges, the expense of the purchase to be borne by the ratepayers; and an increase in the duty on coal is suggested, as if that article of consumption were not sufficiently costly at the present time. The Metropolitan Board are, as I before stated, raising a further sum of £2,000,000, which will have to be paid by the ratepayers, both principal and interest; and many other similar

liens upon the rates are spoken of, among them being the sum of half a million for the purchase of Northumberland House, apart from other sums required to form the roadway from Charing Cross to the Thames Embankment. All of these will possibly be carried out if something like determination of purpose is not shown by the ratepayers at the present time to resist them, if not definitely, at least till some reform of the different abuses I have brought forward has been effected.

And do not imagine, brother ratepayers, that I have mentioned a tithe of the various acts of injustice which from time to time have been perpetrated on us, and, alas! all under the protection of the law, which, in spite of its assumed wisdom, has not succeeded in making its ordinances commonly honest. Before speaking of the manner in which we may try to obtain a remedy, let me endeavour in some crude way, if possible, to classify for the ratepayers—and by ratepayers I mean the population at large, not paupers under the

Poor-law administration—the different grievances under which we labour, and afterwards suggest some means which should be taken for their remedy.

1. I submit that I have shown, though somewhat imperfectly, the enormous extravagance connected with our Poor-law administration, as far as regards the able-bodied poor, the sick, and the aged.

2. I have shown, or rather have pointed out, the way for the reader to ascertain, should he think the subject worth investigating, that the funds of the endowed medical establishments of London are sufficient at the least, if managed with the economy shown in the administration of the funds of Westminster Hospital, to maintain all the Poor-law infirmaries attached to the workhouses, as well as dispensaries, without coming on the ratepayers for assistance; leaving at the same time a sufficient balance in the hands of the governors of those charities (especially St. Bartholomew's and St. Thomas's Hos-

pitals) to accommodate as many patients as are at present under their control.

3. I have shown the unnecessary cost thrown upon the ratepayer, in consequence of the extravagance and jobbery connected with our educational endowments; the funds of the endowed educational charities in the Metropolis being amply sufficient for the maintenance, clothing, and education not only of the children at present maintained in these charities, but, assuming the cost of each child to be limited to 6*s*. a week, to educate, maintain, and clothe the whole of the pauper children at present in the Hanwell, Plashet, Annerly, and other district schools, leaving possibly a balance over, sufficient for the gratuitous education of the whole of the children of the working classes in the Metropolis.

4. I have shown that by the amalgamation or concentration of those endowed schools—half charitable, half free—having with them certain pensioners upon their funds, as adopted by the admirable system of manage-

ment in Edinburgh, according to the "Endowed Institutions (Scotland) Act," not only might the pensioners receive £50 a year (double the amount accorded to them in Scotland), but the buildings and remainder of the funds, if appropriated to educational purposes, would form an amount so large, that the whole of the middle-class elementary education of the Metropolis need not cost more than 2*s.* 6*d.* a quarter, while the highest that could possibly be given, both for males and females, would average, including books, £6 a year.

5. That the public have allowed, without opposition, the useless extravagance perpetrated in Dulwich College, and the removal of the Charterhouse Schools to a distance of more than thirty miles from London, and then under arrangements so expensive as utterly to preclude a man who may have a family of five or six children, and whose income does not exceed £400 a year, from deriving the slightest benefit from them.

6. I have shown that the City Companies hold in their hands enormous charitable and benevolent funds, which are administered in the most extravagant manner, and which, by being returned to their original trades, and managed with common economy, might yield treble the advantage they do at the present day. That land of a most valuable description has been lying waste and unproductive for more than thirty years in the richest part of the City; the poor who formerly inhabited the houses erected on it having been driven away without pity, and the different charities and institutions endowed for their benefit being applied for other and less useful purposes. That, by a system of destruction of the dwellings of the poor, the working classes are in great numbers driven to reside far away from the scene of their labours, while every means that ingenuity can invent are put in force to impede their return. That heavy taxation, in the shape of fresh lunatic asylums, hospitals, public gardens,

and abolition of bridge tolls, is looming in the future.

And now it may be asked, what remedy would I apply to combat and reform this enormous and conglomerate mass of abuses? I candidly admit I have none. The means must be invented by wiser heads than mine. All I would suggest is—

1. That the subject should be entertained simultaneously by all Boards of Guardians and Vestries in the Metropolis.

2. That should the majority of these different bodies be of opinion that the reformation is needed, they should establish a Congress to take the matter into general consideration. Should the subject then be found worthy of entertaining, I would suggest that each separate Vestry should determine to bring it energetically under the consideration of the inhabitants of their separate districts, explaining to all in what manner the grievances at present existing affect each individual.

3. That the wealthier classes and larger

shopkeepers are paying rates far exceeding what is required for the benefits obtained; that a large portion of the excess results from mismanagement, jobbery, and (if it had not been for the protection accorded them by the law) from something closely reaching peculation; that by energetically acting in the matter, and by a reformation in the whole system, not only will their rates be greatly reduced, but, while benefiting their own pockets, they will be indirectly, and effectually, aiding the poor to receive far greater advantages than they at present derive from the different charitable endowments left for their benefit. Let them explain to the man of moderate income—such as middle and junior clerks in public offices, counting-houses, and lawyers' offices, small tradesmen, and widows with limited incomes—that they have been grossly wronged by the removal of the Charterhouse Schools, the present organization and rebuilding of Dulwich College, and the proposed removal of others into

the country, and with fees for tuition so high, that it might almost be supposed that the advisers and supporters of the system adopted it solely for the purpose of placing an insurmountable barrier against the more numerous and respectable class in London—those with incomes of from £200 to £400 a year—receiving any benefit whatever from the funds left for their use. Let them show the working classes the injustice inflicted on them by driving them into the suburbs, passing laws which have the effect of prohibiting their return into the centre of the Metropolis, while the educational and charitable endowments established for their welfare are being applied for other uses.

4. Let it be explained to tradesmen and artisans in general the frauds committed on them by applying the funds of the different Livery Companies to purposes widely opposed to their original intentions. Let them be told of the enormous sums yearly wasted by these companies in feasting—the amount expended

at one feast frequently being such as would be sufficient to supply the whole members of the craft or trade in the Metropolis with a dinner, and leave a considerable balance over; while at present not even the crumbs which fall from the rich man's table are allowed to reach them.

Tell them all this, and then invite them to co-operate for energetic action. If they consent, the result will be the exposure of many fearful London frauds at present perpetrated with impunity—frauds which possibly far exceed the notorious New York frauds, only with the exception that, while the execrations of all honest men have been poured upon the latter, in London they have not only been sanctified by our law authorities, but our bishops have stood by, "like dumb dogs that bark not," and have calmly watched Christ's legatees—the poor—spoiled of their inheritance, even in many cases uttering their benediction upon the spoiler. Let them resolve, in case the hackneyed argument should be brought for-

ward that the country is at present in that flourishing state of prosperity (a very doubtful assertion, by-the-by), the inhabitants of the Metropolis have no reason to object to the £500,000 a year—about the sum at which I estimate our present annual surcharge;—let them, I say, resolve that for the future they will insist on having some return for their money, and not allow it, as at present, to fill up the void occasioned by mismanagement, jobbery, stupidity, gluttony, and possibly, in many instances, direct fraud.

THE END.

PRINTED BY VIRTUE AND CO., CITY ROAD, LONDON.

LIST OF BOOKS

PUBLISHED BY

STRAHAN AND CO

56, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON.

By ALFRED TENNYSON, D.C.L.,

POET LAUREATE.

1. POEMS. Small 8vo, 9s.
2. MAUD, and other Poems. Small 8vo, 5s.
3. THE PRINCESS. Small 8vo, 5s.
4. IDYLLS OF THE KING. Small 8vo, 7s.

——————————— Collected, small 8vo, 12s.

5. ENOCH ARDEN, &c. Small 8vo, 6s.
6. THE HOLY GRAIL, and other Poems. Small 8vo, 7s.

SELECTIONS FROM THE ABOVE WORKS. Square 8vo, cloth extra, 5s.

SONGS FROM THE ABOVE WORKS. Square 8vo, cloth extra, 5s.

IN MEMORIAM. Small 8vo, 6s.

LIBRARY EDITION OF MR. TENNYSON'S WORKS. 6 vols., post 8vo, 10s. 6d. each.

POCKET VOLUME EDITION OF MR. TENNYSON'S WORKS. 10 vols. in neat case, £2 5s.; gilt extra, £2 10s.

THE WINDOW; OR, THE SONGS OF THE WRENS. A series of Songs by ALFRED TENNYSON, with Music by ARTHUR SULLIVAN. 4to, cloth gilt extra, 21s.

By the DUKE of ARGYLL.

1. THE REIGN OF LAW. Crown 8vo, 6s. People's Edition. Limp cloth, 2s. 6d.
2. PRIMEVAL MAN. An Examination of some Recent Speculations. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.
3. IONA. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

By HENRY ALFORD, D.D.,

LATE DEAN OF CANTERBURY.

1. THE BOOK OF GENESIS AND PART OF THE BOOK OF EXODUS. A Revised Version, with Marginal References and an Explanatory Commentary. Demy 8vo, 12s.
2. THE NEW TESTAMENT. Authorised Version Revised. Long Primer Edition, Crown 8vo, 6s. Brevier Edition, fcap. 8vo, 3s. 6d. Nonpareil Edition, small 8vo, 1s. 6d.
3. ESSAYS AND ADDRESSES, chiefly on Church Subjects. Demy 8vo, 7s. 6d.
4. THE YEAR OF PRAYER; being Family Prayers for the Christian Year. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.; Small 8vo, 1s. 6d.
5. THE YEAR OF PRAISE; being Hymns with Tunes for the Sundays and Holidays of the Year. Large type, with music, 3s. 6d.; without music, 1s. Small type, with music, 1s. 6d.; without music, 6d. Tonic Sol-fa Edition, 1s. 6d.
6. HOW TO STUDY THE NEW TESTAMENT. 3 vols., small 8vo, 3s. 6d. each.
7. LETTERS FROM ABROAD. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.
8. THE QUEEN'S ENGLISH. A Manual of Idiom and Usage. New and Enlarged Edition. Small 8vo, 5s.

By PETER BAYNE.

1. THE DAYS OF JEZEBEL. An Historical Drama. Crown 8vo, 6s.
2. THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF HUGH MILLER. 2 vols., demy 8vo, 32s.

By Professor J. S. BLACKIE.

LAYS OF THE HIGHLANDS AND ISLANDS. Small 8vo, 6s.

By ROBERT BUCHANAN.

1. LONDON POEMS. Crown 8vo, 6s.
2. IDYLS AND LEGENDS OF INVERBURN Crown 8vo, 6s.
3. UNDERTONES. Small 8vo, 6s.
4. THE BOOK OF ORM. Crown 8vo, 6s.
5. NAPOLEON FALLEN. A Lyrical Drama. Crown 8vo 3s. 6d.
6. THE DRAMA OF KINGS. Post 8vo, 12s.
7. THE FLESHLY SCHOOL OF POETRY. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

By the late THOMAS GUTHRIE, D.D.

1. STUDIES OF CHARACTER FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT. First and Second Series, crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. each.
2. THE PARABLES READ IN THE LIGHT OF THE PRESENT DAY. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
3. MAN AND THE GOSPEL. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
4. OUR FATHER'S BUSINESS. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
5. OUT OF HARNESS. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
6. SPEAKING TO THE HEART. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
7. THE ANGELS' SONG. 18mo, 1s. 6d.
8. EARLY PIETY. 18mo, 1s. 6d.
9. SUNDAYS ABROAD. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
10. SAVING KNOWLEDGE. Addressed to Young Men. By the late THOMAS GUTHRIE, D.D., and W. G. BLAIKIE, D.D. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.

By AUGUSTUS J. C. HARE.

1. MEMORIALS OF A QUIET LIFE. 2 vols., crown 8vo.
2. WALKS IN ROME. 2 vols., crown 8vo, 21s.
3. WANDERINGS IN SPAIN. With illustrations. Crown 8vo, 10s. 6d.

By Sir J. F. W. HERSCHEL, Bart.

FAMILIAR LECTURES ON SCIENTIFIC SUBJECTS. Crown 8vo, 6s.

By J. S. HOWSON, D.D.,
DEAN OF CHESTER.

1. THE METAPHORS OF ST. PAUL. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
2. THE COMPANIONS OF ST. PAUL. Crown 8vo, 5s.
3. THE CHARACTER OF ST. PAUL. Crown 8vo.

By JEAN INGELOW.

1. STUDIES FOR STORIES, from Girls' Lives. With Illustrations by Millais and others. Crown 8vo, cloth gilt extra, 5s.
2. A SISTER'S BYE HOURS. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, cloth gilt extra, 5s.
3. STORIES TOLD TO A CHILD. With Illustrations. Square 32mo, cloth gilt extra, 3s. 6d.
4. MOPSA THE FAIRY. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo., cloth gilt extra, 5s.

By the Rev. CHARLES KINGSLEY,
CANON OF CHESTER.

1. TOWN GEOLOGY. Crown 8vo, 5s.
2. MADAM HOW AND LADY WHY. With Illustrations. Square 8vo, cloth gilt extra, 7s. 6d.
3. SELECTIONS FROM WRITINGS. With Portraits. Crown 8vo, 6s.

By GEORGE MACDONALD, LL.D.

1. ANNALS OF A QUIET NEIGHBOURHOOD. Crown 8vo, 6s.
2. THE SEABOARD PARISH. Crown 8vo, 6s.
3. WILFRID CUMBERMEDE. Crown 8vo, 6s.
4. THE DISCIPLE, and other Poems. Crown 8vo, 6s.
5. UNSPOKEN SERMONS. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
6. THE MIRACLES OF OUR LORD. Crown 8vo, 5s.
7. RANALD BANNERMAN'S BOYHOOD. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, cloth extra, 5s.
8. AT THE BACK OF THE NORTH WIND. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, cloth gilt extra, 5s.
9. THE PRINCESS AND THE GOBLIN. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, cloth gilt extra, 5s.
10. DEALINGS WITH THE FAIRIES. With Illustrations by ARTHUR HUGHES. Square 32mo, cloth gilt extra, 2s. 6d.
11. WORKS OF FANCY AND IMAGINATION; being a Reprint of Poetical and other Works. Pocket Volume Edition, in neat case, £2 2s.

By the late NORMAN MACLEOD, D.D.

1. PEEPS AT THE FAR EAST. An Account of a Visit to India. With Illustrations. Square 8vo, cloth gilt extra, 21s.
2. EASTWARD. Travels in Egypt, Syria, and Palestine. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 6s.
3. THE STARLING. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 6s.
4. REMINISCENCES OF A HIGHLAND PARISH. Crown 8vo, 6s.
5. THE OLD LIEUTENANT AND HIS SON. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
6. THE EARNEST STUDENT. Memorials of John Mackintosh. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
7. THE GOLD THREAD. With Illustrations. Square 8vo, 2s. 6d.
8. PARISH PAPERS. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
9. SIMPLE TRUTH SPOKEN TO WORKING PEOPLE. Small 8vo, 2s. 6d.
10. THE TEMPTATION OF OUR LORD. Crown 8vo, 5s.

00098431

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018